

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLV

MARCH, 1947

NO. 1011

On Faith and Marriage

HIS HOLINESS, POPE PIUS XII

*An address to members of the Ecclesiastical Court of the Rota, October 6, 1946**

A YEAR has passed, beloved Sons, since we last saw you gathered before Us. For you it has been a year of hard work, notably so in the section devoted to matrimonial cases. Returning to a topic introduced at Our previous allocution, We seize the occasion of today's meeting to touch once more on a theme which forms the burden of your professional activity. Your respected Dean has also referred to it in his regular report.

In Our introduction of last year We spoke of the difference between the judicial procedures of Church and State. We began, in effect, by examining the basic distinction, from the point of view of their *source* and *nature*, of the two sovereign powers, for each of which the judicial function is an important and necessary prerogative. We were led to conclude that there exists an essential difference likewise between the judicial procedures of both powers, despite their resemblance in several respects.

The same conclusion is reached when We contrast the *objects* proper to the procedure of each. Here also there are common elements and elements that are dissimilar.

In the two perfect societies, it is clear, concern for the common good (*bonum commune*) requires that provision be made for recognition, guarantee and restoration in court of the rights and goods of their mem-

* Translation by the Rev. J. Edward Coffey, S.J., Associate Editor of *America*.

bers. These personal and property rights, moreover, are partly the same in Church and State. Clearly the Church is also a visible society. Her life is conditioned, like the life of man, by the physical elements of time and space.

On the other hand, there are rights and goods so peculiar and proper to ecclesiastical jurisdiction by their very nature that they are not and cannot be the object of the State's judicial control.

I

PROTECTION OF THE FAITH

Among the possessions which ecclesiastical courts (diocesan as well as Papal) have safeguarded through the ages, quite tenaciously at times, we must point out *the Faith itself*, the basis of all supernatural life. The Court for the Protection of the Catholic Faith is, therefore, a legitimate organ of judicial authority in the Church, inasmuch as the latter is a perfect religious society. The function of this Court is to reply juridically to every attack directed against one of the most vital and important possessions of the Church. Heresy and apostasy are offenses which could never leave the Church indifferent or unmoved. It is doubtless true that the tribunal charged with the defense of the Faith may in the course of the centuries have assumed forms and used methods uncalled for in the nature of things, yet explainable in the light of special historical circumstances. But it would be fallacious to argue from this against the legitimacy of the Court itself.

We are aware that the very mention of the name of this Court is an affront to the feelings of many of our contemporaries. We allude to those whose minds and hearts are fascinated by a doctrine which—rejecting any notion of the supernatural and revealed truth—claims for human reason the capacity to understand the full meaning of the world, as also the right to dominate the whole of life, and which by the same token calls for the individual's complete emancipation from any bond of subordination whatsoever.

We are familiar with the sources of this doctrine, its champions and the progress it has made. We are perfectly conscious of its influence on intellectual, moral and social life, as in economics and politics. We are equally enlightened on its varying fortunes during the course of recent centuries, especially during the last hundred years. Its defenders appeal to the principle of "freedom of conscience" and "tolerance" in matters spiritual, especially in religion. Yet it happens all too often that the

moment they succeed in winning power, they make it their most pressing business to violate people's consciences and to impose the yoke of oppression on their Catholic subjects, especially in matters touching the rights of parents to provide for the education of their children.

Though the "modern conscience" may be of the opinion that the punishment of offenses injurious to Faith in days gone by sometimes went beyond the limits of justice, society generally today, in contrast, shows itself too insensitive and indifferent to these same offenses.

The ever-increasing contacts and indiscriminate mingling of various religious denominations within the same national groups have induced the civil courts to apply the principle of "tolerance" and "freedom of conscience." In such circumstances, let Us add, Catholics are in duty bound to practise political, civic and social tolerance with respect to the faithful of other denominations.

The Church herself, in Canon 1351 of the Code of Canon Law, has given legal sanction to the maxim: *Ad amplexandam fidem Catholicam nemo invitus cogatur* (Let no one be compelled to embrace the Catholic Faith against his will). This canon is couched in the very words used by our great Predecessor Leo XIII in the encyclical *Immortale Dei*, issued November 1, 1885. It is a faithful echo of the doctrine taught by the Church since the very earliest years of Christianity. Let it suffice Us to quote the testimony of Lactantius, written between the years 305 and 310:

There is no need of violence or injustice. Religion cannot be imposed by force. To obtain what we desire, words, not blows, should be used. That is why we keep no one who does not wish to stay with us. . . . The man without loyalty and faith is useless before God. . . . There is nothing so voluntary as religion. When the spirit is lacking in him who offers sacrifice, religion itself has already disappeared; it is already dead. (*Divinae Institutiones*, 1. 5, c. 9—*Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.*, vol. XIX, pp. 463-465.)

Whereas, consequently, a few days ago, according to newspaper reports, it was officially stated, in the course of a scandalous trial, that the Pope also had approved "the said forced conversions"—and that for motives of national imperialism, which would be a still more serious charge—We have the right and the duty to deny so false an accusation. And to support Our assertion with serious documentary proof, We think it opportune to read to you a memorandum from our Secretariat of State, dated January 25, 1942, in answer to an inquiry addressed to the Holy See by the Yugoslav legation touching the circumstances of these

conversions. It should be noted besides that neither the Holy See nor the Catholic Bishops of Croatia, as the legation itself has expressly agreed, have had any part at all in this conversion movement. Here, then, is the text of Our memorandum:¹

Referring to the note of the Royal Yugoslav Legation to the Holy See No. 1-42 of the ninth instant, the office of His Holiness' Secretary of State has the honor to communicate to the same Legation the following information:

According to the principles of Catholic teaching, conversion should be the result not of coercion from without but of sincere interior assent to the truths taught by the Catholic Church. That is why the Catholic Church grants admission to those adults desiring to be received or to return to her only on condition that they are fully conscious of the meaning and effect of the action they propose to take.

Consequently, the fact that a considerable number of Croatian dissidents should suddenly express the desire to be admitted to membership in the Catholic Church could not fail to trouble deeply the Croatian episcopate, which is of course responsible for the protection of Catholic interests in Croatia.

Far from according official approval, either explicitly or implicitly, to the situation of fact, the bishops made it a matter of duty to remind the interested parties explicitly that dissidents must be guaranteed entire freedom of choice in the matter of their return to the Faith. They made it clear at the same time that regulations and directives touching conversion remain within the exclusive competence of ecclesiastical authorities.

The Bishops' Committee set up forthwith to handle and decide all such cases was established precisely for the purpose of seeing to it that conversions, in conformity with the principles of Catholic teaching, should be the fruit of persuasion, not of constraint.

The Holy See, also, for its part, will not fail to recommend and to urge the exact observance of the prescriptions of canon law and of instructions given to this effect.

To pick up again the thread of Our argument, We must add that the ecclesiastical Court, in exercising its jurisdiction, cannot adopt the rules of action followed by the civil tribunals. The Catholic Church, as we have said before, is a perfect society, based on truth infallibly revealed by God. Whatever is opposed to this truth is necessarily error; and error may not be accorded objectively the same rights as truth. Thus freedom of thought and freedom of conscience are essentially limited by the veracity of the God of Revelation. We say "essentially limited," because truth is really not equal to error, and a man's conscience, if it be sound,

¹ From Msgr. Venini, who was standing at his side, the Pope received the French text of the memorandum under date of Jan. 25, 1942, taken from the files of the Secretariat of State, which he proceeded to read in French.

is really the voice of God. Hence it follows that a member of the Church may not without fault deny or repudiate the Catholic truth he has once known and accepted. And when the Church, having certain proof of the fact of heresy or apostasy, punishes the guilty party by excluding him from communion with the faithful, she remains strictly within the field of her competence, and acts, so to speak, as guardian of her household rights.

II

MARRIAGE IS SACRED

A second object which throws into bold relief the difference between the judicial procedures of Church and State is *marriage*. Because the Creator has willed it to be, marriage is a *res sacra*, a sacred thing. For this reason, the marriage of baptized persons, by its very nature, remains outside the sphere of civil authority. But even where the parties are not baptized, marriage legitimately contracted is a sacred thing in the natural order. The civil courts, therefore, have no power to dissolve it, and the Church has never recognized the validity of divorce decrees in such cases. This does not mean that in determined circumstances an outright declaration of the nullity of the marriage itself—a judgment relatively rare compared with decrees of divorce—may not be justly pronounced by the civil courts, and recognized accordingly by the Church.

There can be no doubt, as everyone knows, that the civil authority has jurisdiction in matters regarding the purely civil effects of marriage (Canon 1016). But the competence of the Church in matrimonial questions is very much more broad and deep, since by Divine appointment it devolves on her to provide especially for the protection of the substance of marriage and to safeguard the sanctity of the contract.

You also, beloved Sons, have a share in this jurisdiction, called as you are to render decisions in cases involving the bonds of matrimony.

We began Our talk by expressing to you Our paternal thanks for the diligent work you have done in this department. We cannot, however, conceal from you now Our anxiety about the growing number of these matrimonial law-suits. I know you are also disturbed about them, as the report We have just heard from your worthy spokesman makes it abundantly clear.

Are not the marriage-cases referred to your Court a reflection and a measure of the progressive disintegration of married life, which threatens to poison and corrupt the morals of our Catholic people? Two

world wars, the second incomparably more than the first, have contributed immensely to this fatal disorder. No one can remain coldly unmoved before this tragic development, with the lamentable consequences it trails in its wake, nor at the thought of the millions of young couples necessarily separated from one another for long months and years. What a deal of courage, self-sacrifice and patience, what a fund of affection and confidence, what live Christian faith was needed to keep their marriage vows intact and to resist temptation! Great numbers, assuredly, with the aid of grace obtained by prayer, were able to stand firm. But how many others beside them have lacked their strength! How many homes have been destroyed! How many spiritual wounds inflicted on their human dignity and conjugal honor! How many sins fatal to family happiness!

Our task is now to repair this ruin, to heal these wounds, to care for these ills. The heart of Mother Church bleeds at the sight of the unspeakable anguish of so many of her children. To help them She will spare no effort, extending her condescension to its utmost limit. This farthest limit of her power is solemnly formulated in Canon 1118 of the Code of Canon Law: *Matrimonium validum ratum et consummatum nulla humana potestate nullaque causa praeterquam morte disolvi potest.* (Valid marriage ratified and consummated can be dissolved by no human power and by no other cause but death).

One of the chief concerns of the Church today, beyond doubt, must be to put a stop, by all possible means, to the decadence of marriage and the family. She is fully aware of this duty, but knows well at the same time that her efforts will be successful only to the degree that conditions generally in the economic, social and above all the moral sphere make it less difficult in practice to lead a married life pleasing to Our Lord. In this regard public authority must shoulder a very serious responsibility.

Nevertheless, dear Sons, while we are waiting for this improvement in public morality, it will be your duty "with fatigue and patience" (*Apoc.* 27) to put up with and control the endless flow of marriage cases. For a plan of action looking toward the purification of marriage and family life is one thing; judicial procedure in the marriage-court is another. To the latter belongs the task of judging and solving cases brought before it impartially, according to the facts and conformably to the standards of canon law.

Continue to bring to the exercise of your charity, along with the unalterable fair-mindedness of the conscientious judge, the conviction that

you are in this way contributing nobly to the building of the Church. The discretion and fairness with which your Court handles also the financial side of the lawsuits themselves, under present straitened economic conditions—the lawyers of the Rota cooperating generously—proves clearly enough that you count your work for what it really is: a service rendered to the genuine welfare of the faithful, the salvation of souls.

III

OBLIGATION OF SECRECY

Among the objects of judicial authority in the Church we must also list those matters (other than the defense of the Faith) which properly concern the tribunal of the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office.² Its procedure is designedly severe by reason of the sacred character of the rights it is its mission to defend, and because of the gravity of the offenses it is called upon to judge. There would be no need to give it special mention here, if its method of procedure were not alleged to be in opposition to the principle, generally accepted today, that *judgments must be rendered publicly*. This is regarded as a necessary guarantee against arbitrary sentences in detriment of justice.

The obligation of secrecy is, in fact, attached to the work of the Supreme Tribunal even in criminal cases. But it is to be noted, first of all, that even the penal procedure of the civil powers makes provision for hearings to be conducted wholly or in part *behind closed doors* in some instances when the common good requires it. This is exactly the principle applied in the penal suits of the Holy Office.

It is indispensable, nevertheless, that all the essential guarantees of a just and equitable verdict be assured in cases of this kind: freedom for the defendant to reply to the charges alleged against him, with opportunity to refute them or to introduce such supporting evidence as he may judge useful; personal liberty for the accused, with freedom of recourse to the aid of counsel officially assigned to the case or selected by the defendant; complete objectivity and honesty in rendering decisions. All these conditions are actually fulfilled in the practice of the Tribunal of the Holy Office.

Yours is a very serious function, beloved Sons, not merely because of its broad range, but particularly by reason of the responsibility it implies and the rigorous work it entails. A holy and charitable office, it is un-

² The Holy Office deals with matters of conscience in the "internal forum."

known to many people and misjudged by others. But the Lord regards it with approval. Knowing the courage with which you labor for His honor, in the service of the Church, for the welfare of souls, for the salvation of the world, He showers grace upon you. In pledge of this boon from on high, We bestow upon you all here present, Our paternal Apostolic Blessing, with all our heart.



The Child

Nor can love fluctuate with the "goodness" or "badness" of a child. A child has the right to feel that he has the love of his parents no matter what he does. He may have to be disciplined, scolded, or even punished—but he must be loved, always. He has to feel that he occupies a place in the family that no one else can fill and that he has the lasting love and affection and understanding of his parents whenever he needs them. Only in such an atmosphere can he gain security and self-assurance and develop into a happy, mature human being.—*From TALK IT OVER, Series G-117, 1946, National Institute of Social Relations, Inc., Washington, D. C.*



Democracy's Hour of Trial

Our democratic way of life is on trial, the test grows hour by hour. Democracy is a living thing. Its health is measured by the health of all of its members. It is a form of society which depends entirely on self control or self government, and therefore it is dependent for its existence upon the spiritual influences. The yearning for freedom, and for a democratic society will not perish. It cannot. That yearning is a part of the soul or spirit of man. But it can be blacked out by tyranny of one kind or another, as it was in Germany and Italy and much of Europe.—*From a speech of John Carson before the Cooperative Congress of Nova Scotia, at Antigonish, Nova Scotia, July 3, 1946.*

The Handicapped Are People

T. J. McINERNEY

*Reprinted from THE MARIANIST**

ONE of the greatest challenges in the fields of public and private education today comes from the several thousands of backward or mentally retarded children in the United States in whose behalf little or nothing is being done to provide the specialized training they need to enable them to obtain an education approximating that which the normal child can acquire.

It is true that there are many state institutions in various parts of the country and that some provision is made in the public school curricula for the so-called "backward student." There are also some private non-sectarian "homes" which have achieved a measure of success in this field. However, it has long been recognized by educators and psychiatrists that the education of the retarded child is best accomplished when a teacher is able to devote *full time* to this difficult task.

Although the education of mentally handicapped children has been effected with considerable success under Catholic auspices in various parts of the country, the surface has only been literally scratched here, too. The notable thing about Catholic efforts along these lines—and something which can be cited with pride—is the fact that large numbers of Sisters and others are

devoting their entire time and energies to the work with gratifying success. There are six Catholic institutions in this highly specialized field of education doing pioneering work and there is room for many, many times that number.

The programs for the study of retarded children now in effect indicate a decided change in educational psychology from that of an earlier day. It is an obvious fact that special child study of any kind would hardly be necessary if all children were alike in ability, capacity and interests. Every educator worthy of the name knows that pupils differ from one another in mental, social, physical and moral attributes, but only recently has the extent of these differences been realized. There was a time not long ago when the tendency was to take pronounced cases of retarded children and exempt them from attending classes, thus effectuating a Pilate-like attitude of "washing hands" of the "whole sordid business."

In the absence of the necessary specialized training required by mentally retarded children (we are not concerned here with the physically handicapped) they are being absorbed in most cases into the regular classes.

* 108 Franklin St., Dayton 2, Ohio, January, 1947

Now, when a handicapped child attends a regular school, the teacher necessarily has to neglect the normal group because the retarded pupil requires more individual attention. Under such circumstances, the spotlight is more or less focused upon his shortcoming, with resultant embarrassment and the danger of development of an inferiority complex. It is obvious, therefore, why the Catholic practice of full-time attention, limited though it may be in actual application under present conditions, is the best and most preferable plan.

Professor Arch O. Heck, of Ohio State University, who has made exhaustive studies of the work being done in educating backward children and of the great potentialities in the field for the future, states in his book, *The Education of Exceptional Children* (McGraw-Hill, 1940), that wherever it is possible to observe the effects of a good program of special education upon the handicapped youth himself, the challenge to extend such programs to every retarded child is "impressive." Professor Heck declares that the fundamental basis of any program should be not merely to make the victims "self-supporting," but rather should the objective be to make it possible for them to lead normal lives, devoid of any possible taint of ostracism or stigma because they fall into the "backward" category.

So little is known about the splendid Catholic contribution to the education

of backward children that it might not be amiss to consider in detail the work being done on their behalf in one of the oldest and most representative of the six schools: the St. Coletta School for Exceptional Children, located in Jefferson, Wisconsin.

A MODEL INSTITUTION

Back in 1904, the Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, motivated by a desire to contribute something tangible to the religious and general education of retarded children, established the nucleus of the institution which today is a model in its field. The aim of the school through nearly forty-three years of service in its chosen field is stated simply, but adequately, by the good Sisters who have dedicated their lives to it: "St. Coletta's has as its purpose to provide its pupils with the means to live lives befitting their dignity as beings created 'in the image and likeness of God!'"

Or to express it in another way: the purpose of the St. Coletta School is to give the mentally handicapped child the maximum opportunities for developing his limited powers in an atmosphere of confidence and joy that will stimulate him to his best efforts.

The grounds and buildings of St. Coletta School comprise some three hundred and eighty acres. The modern Administration building and the various cottages are beautifully grouped on a series of terraces. At the foot of the lowest of these is an exten-

sive sunken garden, with an outdoor swimming pool. On the crest of the highest terrace is a grotto of Our Lady modeled after that of Lourdes. A large wooded picnic grove, distinct from the regular playground area, constitutes a natural background for the entire setting. The orchard, vineyard and vegetable gardens contribute to the sustenance of the children and at the same time provide them with a source of recreation and instruction in that they learn how to grow and care for fruits and vegetables.

In charge of this modern and beautiful plant is a staff of seventy Sisters of St. Francis, who have consecrated their lives to the work. Assisting them are trained nurses, an attending dentist, physicians and a director of physical education. The talents and services of all unite in making the school as homelike as consecrated service is capable of making it and as efficient as science and specialized training can make it.

Both boys and girls of six years of age and upward are admitted to St. Coletta's. There is nothing haphazard about such admissions—much depends upon the possibilities the individual child shows of improving under training. A child is accepted at first on probation only, and if it becomes evident that improvement is not possible, the parent or guardian is requested to remove the youngster. Although the first week in September is the preferred time for enrollment, children

are accepted at any time during the year. Only backward children and those considered as being mentally retarded are accepted, since the school is especially adapted to care for this type of youngster. Hence, those subject to epilepsy, convulsion, or those afflicted with idiocy or insanity are ineligible. While St. Coletta's is essentially a Catholic institution, children not of the faith are accepted provided they meet other admission requirements.

The curriculum includes the following subjects: Religion, academic work, manual training, health education, industrial arts and industrial work. Scientific tests and practical judgment (acquired through years of experience) are used by the Sisters to determine the needs of each child. With these in mind, specially trained teachers are employed.

Since Religion confers the greatest benefit on man for time and eternity, specific religious training is given and for this purpose there are two resident chaplains. The youngsters attend Mass daily and assemble at regular intervals for prayer. They are also given instruction in Christian doctrine and Bible History. Those who show sufficient intelligence and appreciation are permitted to receive the Sacraments. Non-Catholics receive a general ethical training and partake of moral instructions.

In order to give the children a general view of important life-situations, the Sisters make use of stories, special

projects, and dramatizations. Correlated with all is training in a sense of duty, respect for authority, thrift, honesty and courtesy. Those who have talent for music are given instruction on various instruments and from among the ones who show special ability a school band functions. Instruction in industrial arts includes plastic art, rug weaving, needlework, clay modeling, while the industrial work for the boys consists of woodwork, brush making, the use of tools and gardening. Home economics for the girls includes cooking, sewing, laundering, home management and decorating. From this brief, but necessarily prosaic description, it can be seen that every possible effort is made to equip these children with the knowledge and capabilities that will make of them useful citizens despite the mental handicap under which they started life.

During the course of their more than four decades of service to handicapped children, the Sisters of St. Francis have found that invariably the retarded child responds wholeheartedly to religious influence. Accordingly, the center of the school is the Chapel where religious services, starting with Mass in the morning and ending with common night prayers in the evening, are held. And as they go about their daily routine of study, play and work, the children pause for brief moments of prayer at the many little shrines on the grounds.

So popular has been the St. Coletta

School at Jefferson, it was deemed advisable some years ago to open another school in a section of the country that would be both healthful for children and easy of access to people living in the Western States. As a result, St. Coletta School of Longmont, Colorado, was opened in 1941. The war and post-war material shortages have delayed plans for a series of buildings to be erected on a site about three miles outside of Longmont and some seven miles from the Rocky Mountain foothills. In the meantime, the Western unit of St. Coletta School functions in temporary buildings because the Sisters are conscious of the urgent need for expanding their work even in the face of inadequate facilities.

ST. MARY OF PROVIDENCE

Another splendid contribution to the Catholic program of educating mentally handicapped children has been made by the Sisters of St. Mary of Providence at the St. Mary of Providence School in Chicago since 1913. This institute cares for nearly two hundred girls at its Chicago school and for a smaller number of older girls and girls requiring a less formal academic program at a branch at Mt. St. Joseph, thirty miles northwest of Chicago, near Lake Zurich.

The Sisters who teach at the St. Mary of Providence Schools are members of an Order known as the Daughters of St. Mary of Providence, which was established seventy years ago by

zealous Italian priest, Don Aloysius Guanella. Father Guanella wrote the Rule for the Order and set up the Mother of Divine Providence as the Model for their activities. Everywhere throughout their institution can be seen the Mother holding her Divine Infant.

Father Guanella established religious orders of priests and of Sisters. The Sisters have made a foundation in this country for the education of the girls. Priests, known as "Servants of Charity," carry on the work for boys in Italy, Switzerland and South America. Although the first six members of the Daughters of St. Mary arrived in this country in 1913 at the invitation of Archbishop Quigley of Chicago to establish an institute for mentally handicapped girls, they were beset by so many disappointments and hardships that the opening of their school had to be postponed. It was not until 1926 that they were able to acquire a former combination church and school building as their headquarters. The building was remodelled to serve as a residence and school and since then many additions have been added. The Daughters are working constantly toward the time when they can develop on their 160 acres at Lake Zurich an institution capable of providing for many hundreds of additional youngsters of both sexes.

During the past year, the Sisters at the Providence School have been experimenting with vocational training

in beauty culture, which they call "personal service." They have done this with a view to finding future employment in beauty shops for those girls who show an aptitude for the work. Other girls are trained to become office workers and others to take up domestic work and the care of small children.

The services to mentally handicapped children being provided by the St. Coletta and the St. Mary of Providence institutes are similar in most respects to those provided by the other Catholic schools who are pioneering in this essential educational work. In the East, the Wharton Memorial Institute at Port Jefferson on Long Island and the St. Gertrude's School of Arts and Crafts in Washington, D. C., have long rendered fine service to retarded children in their respective areas. In the Far West, St. Vincent's School at Santa Barbara, California, has a similarly fine record of achievement.

The splendid pioneering work being done by these half-dozen Catholic institutions in making mentally retarded children more useful citizens is illustrative of the great concern shown by the Church for its unfortunate children in every category of human frailty. It must be borne in mind, however, that this work in the field of educating mentally handicapped children is only in its infancy. There is, as Professor Heck and other experts in the field point out, a scarcity of data as to what is being done and a corresponding lack

of public information on the need for a broader program. The public interest in the problem stems from the fact that adequate education of the mentally handicapped is financially good for society because it removes the likelihood of their becoming public wards. Moreover, being self-sufficient will make them better citizens. To quote Professor Heck:

Handicapped children are the same qualitatively as normal children; they have the same traits and characteristics. They differ in that they do not have a given trait or characteristic to the same degree; the difference is quantitative, not qualitative.

Among the many barriers to be overcome in expanding Catholic activity in a field wherein a good footing has already been established, the most acute one is a shortage of those willing to dedicate themselves to the task. Though at the present time the Catholic approach to this problem is through the virtue of Charity, it would be a

mistake to think that it is not also a matter of justice. More than other forms of Catholic education, this work will always depend for its accomplishment upon the consecrated lives of Religious, and there is no question that for these men and women, Christian Charity is the only motive for their consecration.

But the same thing is true of the predominant place of Religious in general Catholic education, which the Church has always accepted as a *duty of justice* towards her children. Every child has a right to an education fitted to his needs and capacities and this entails a duty first of all upon the parents; then upon the natural societies to which they belong.

It is not, therefore, an act of charity only, to give retarded children adequate training to equip them to meet their responsibilities as human beings and as members of the true Church. They can claim such an opportunity in all justice.



Chinese Communists

A very harmful and immensely provocative phase of the Chinese Communist party procedure has been in the character of its propaganda. I wish to state to the American people that in the deliberate misrepresentation and abuse of the action, policies and purposes of our Government this propaganda has been without regard for the truth, without any regard whatsoever for the facts, and has given plain evidence of a determined purpose to mislead the Chinese people and the world and to arouse a bitter hatred of Americans.—*General George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, January 7, 1947.*

AFL on Communism

Report adopted at the 65th Convention, Chicago, Ill., October, 1946

YOUR committee believes that this convention should adopt a statement, relative to its attitude toward Communism, which will inform American trade unionists, the public and all public officials of the position of the American Federation of Labor.

WHAT DOES COMMUNISM MEAN?

It is our purpose to present a definition of Communism in the sense in which we use that term in this report, so that when trade unionists use it there will be no mistake, no misunderstanding of what is being referred to, for no term is being more loosely applied in conversation, in the press and in public life.

Assuredly, Communism is an extreme of radicalism or reactionaryism, but the great majority of those in our country who have advanced liberal or radical views are not Communists; generally, they are vigorous anti-Communists in the proper use of that term. In the definition of Communism submitted, your committee believes it is fully justified in definitely applying it to the Communist dictatorship which has been established in Russia and the activities of that dictatorship as it is applied in international relations.

It is not the Communist theory—or deviation from it—by those now controlling the Russian people which con-

cerns us. Whatever may be the effect of the Communist dictatorship upon the people of Russia and their opportunities to expand free institutions and advance their own standards of living is their problem and not ours.

What does concern us, and concern us vitally, are the efforts of Moscow to actively and systematically interfere in the internal affairs of Americans, their form of government and their institutions of human freedom, and, internationally, to use the Communist dictator's influence to prevent the development and expansion of free institutions in other countries whose people desire to be free and self-governing.

Our fully justified opposition to Russian Communism is its active and persistent determination to make use of American institutions, freedom of speech and of the press to spread within our borders the poisonous and subversive doctrine that our institutions and our freedom are a delusion and a snare; that under them we are helpless to solve our internal social and economic problems; that the only way by which Americans can save themselves is to accept the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat which in Russia is supine submission to the edicts of a Communist dictator, implemented by nation-wide blood and other purges, and

the suppression of all free institutions.

Realizing that the progress of Russian Communism in other nations would depend upon winning labor's support, the Kremlin policy, from the beginning, was to have its agents and their followers infiltrate into the trade union movement of every country and secure a controlling position in the formulation of trade union policy and trade union education.

From the day the Communist Party in the United States was established, much of its energy was devoted to organizing so-called "cells" in local trade unions, other groups and in manufacturing plants. Their methods were to spread dissatisfaction and suspicion in the workers' minds toward the structure of their organization and the loyalty and integrity of their officers, and to create the belief that every employer, for that very reason, was an enemy of the workers. Furthermore, their purpose was to foster the treasonable belief that government by law under free institutions enslaved instead of freed the workers.

Their efforts to infiltrate into the ranks of the American Federation of Labor were largely futile. They gained no sound foothold. Their opportunity came when the CIO was organized in 1935. The Communist Party in the United States immediately gave its public and official endorsement to the CIO. It gave that organization so much assistance from the first that it secured a patronage

which, by 1938, had led to the employment of over 280 active Communists as salaried CIO organizers and a number of others as part-time workers. Many of these members of the Communist Party became officers in national unions affiliated with the CIO.

At present, this condition is causing bitter division in the ranks of that dual organization, and already has greatly weakened its effectiveness. Unquestionably, the majority of the membership of the CIO is composed of loyal and patriotic Americans who are now dismayed as they understand the use which Moscow is making of their organization.

The Communist Party in this country, early in its activities, established so-called schools in which the zealous and pliant members were taught the tactics of rioting, destruction of property and seizure of plants in connection with strikes and, in addition, taught how to stir up workers so that they would strike. Some of the results of this were indicated during that period when, to assist the treaty of friendship existing between the Nazi dictatorship and Russia, widespread strikes were engineered in American plants manufacturing munitions for national defense. It was not until Hitler attacked Russia that the Communists changed their party line on this subversive activity.

For reasons which it is difficult to understand, the Communist Party in the United States was able to place de-

pendable members of the party in many of the Federal departments, including the Department of State. The entire story of this infiltration has not yet been told, but it is known that members of the Communist Party employed in government departments purloined secret state and other papers, many of which were vital to national defense, which were photostated before being returned to their files and the photostats forwarded to Moscow. Some of the documents were reproduced in Communist publications in this country. The daily press has kept the American public informed of some of the steps being taken by the authorities to eliminate known Communists from positions in the government, and to provide that in the future no one could be on the Federal payroll who was engaged in subversive activities.

As American trade unionists, we are carrying aloft the torch of human liberty which the Communists now seem determined to extinguish so that conceptions of human liberty, conceived by our European ancestors in rebellion against tyrannical government and upon which we have built our nation, with its free institutions, can be eliminated from the world, and a godless, arbitrary dictatorship established in its place.

The issue presented by Russian Communism which the Kremlin is endeavoring to force upon the world, is the most vital one which our people have faced since they won the Revolu-

tion and shook off the control over them which had been imposed by Great Britain's King and Parliament, in which our Colonial ancestors had neither voice nor vote.

Russian Communism, by every means at its command, is endeavoring to establish in our country the same conditions which now exist in Russia under the domination of a dictator, where any opposition to him or the form of government which he controls becomes treason to the state, to be punished as such.

The American Federation of Labor, without exceptions, has vigorously opposed any economic or political theory which subordinates the rights of the individual to the domination of the state. From our Colonial period on, Americans have defended the proposition that the state exists solely for the people who live in it, in contradiction to the former European conception that monarchs and rulers were vested with a divine right to exploit the people and keep them under arbitrary control. In the United States, Americans have been the rulers and the state made responsive to the will of the majority.

AFL FIGHTS STATE CONTROL

Throughout the history of the American Federation of Labor it has opposed every effort by the state to encroach upon labor's constitutional rights; its right to voluntary association; its right to formulate those policies for its welfare which were of its

own choosing. If we are to have free enterprise, there must be free labor, and there cannot be either unless, as Americans, we maintain our free institutions. Whenever the state has interfered with labor's basic rights, labor has aroused its membership, won public support and, through this, secured not only necessary remedial legislation, but legislation which more clearly defined labor's rights, including the declaration that labor could not be looked upon by the state or by employers as a commodity or article of commerce.

There can be no loyalty by any citizens to our nation's form of government and its institutions of freedom if they give their first allegiance to the Communist dictatorship and the policies emanating from the Kremlin.

U. S. LABOR'S PROGRESS

Americans, through the application of free institutions under a written constitution and government by law through the peoples' chosen representatives, have advanced socially, educationally and materially to a greater extent than any modern nation. Wage-earners, through their trade unions, have won the right to discuss every problem with their employers and work out mutually acceptable understandings.

While there remains much to be

done in the interest of American wage-earners, while they have not achieved the full standard of living to which they are entitled, the fact remains that in no country in the world at the present time is labor better situated than in the United States, and nowhere else does labor enjoy the same degree of industrial democracy.

Communism at present is the most dynamic reactionary force in our country. If Communism should control, then every social, economic and political right which Americans have won since the Revolutionary War would be destroyed.

DEMOCRACY OR DESTRUCTION

American workers will not surrender the advantages they have gained—or the opportunities in the future—for a government under which the workers must listen first for their master's voice before they dare to speak.

Your committee recommends that this convention of the American Federation of Labor reaffirm its vigorous and unyielding opposition to the establishment in our country of any form of dictatorship, and that it further carry on a constant and widespread education, so that the machinations, the methods and the purposes of Communists in carrying on subversive activities will be clearly exposed and defeated.

"Political Catholicism"

*Reprinted from PEOPLE & FREEDOM**

THEY are back in force, the old, time-worn clichés. You find them in speeches and editorials in Continental Europe. You can hear their echo over here: "Vatican forces," "Political Catholicism" (Goebbels' favorite)!

What has happened? In France, in Italy, in Belgium, in the Netherlands, in the Germanies (once more that historic pre-1871 appellation fits) and in Austria there have been elections and in all these countries there have come to the fore parties either officially named Christian-Democrats or so described because of the lodestone of their motivating philosophy; some of them new, some of them revived after totalitarian suppression.

They all have one thing in common: they believe that Christianity, which gave the foundation to what we were once proud to call the Western Civilization, is still as it was in the days of the downfall of the Roman-Greek civilization, a creative and vitalizing force; that this force should be applied to the social, economic and political orientation of the human society; that it can and will help to solve the great and difficult problems of our times according to the realities of our times.

The millions of Europeans who have thus expressed their will have lived to witness the disaster which has overtaken a world that, under the banners and slogans of enlightenment and rationalism, of materialism and progress, had been proudly marching into an ever better future where men would be as gods. A world disdainful of all Christian spiritual and ethical values, yet using them as trappings.

They are surrounded by what Pascal predicted as the ultimate fate of a godless humanity: men have become monsters and the world a chaos.

They have seen and they still see today that, torn from their Christian moorings, the ethical and moral precepts which still survive from a Christian past have lost all power to direct the acts of statesmen and the behavior of peoples. Even the concepts of liberty, fraternity and equality, unknown and unthinkable in the pre-Christian world, have become mere catch-words to justify the enslavement, maltreatment and dispossession of millions of fellow humans, fellow Europeans.

These millions have learned by bitter suffering what they had hardly

* 32, Chepstow Villas, London, W. 11, June, 1946

been conscious of before, that a civilization is not based primarily on commerce, industry and the national income, but on spiritual values. They feel that "Let Europe live!" demands more than the renewed flow of goods across her frontiers.

In these millions, words like "the mother continent of our civilization," used by Field Marshal Smuts in his moving broadcast appeal after his visit to Germany, and the words of Mr. Bevin in Bournemouth on "the old cradle of civilization" stir up emotions which only those can feel as deep and poignant who in their own lives are still in spiritual communion with the generations which, in the dawn of our civilization, lived Christian lives in a still un-Christian Europe.

From such perceptions, such thoughts and emotions have sprung in the Christian millions on the continent the will and determination to revive and remake Europe and Europe's civilization by the Faith they feel in themselves.

By the measure of their success in restoring the European Commonwealth of Christian nations, and restoring it quickly, and not by the sneers and attacks of their opponents among the old-fashioned materialists and rationalists, will the political words and deeds of the great Christian-Democratic movement in Europe be judged.



Accentuate the Positive!

America has little to fear from Communism if all Americans have the opportunity to decent living. People who are properly fed, and housed and clothed are not interested in Communism. So perhaps it is time we heard less about the evils of Communism and more about full employment, a living family wage, human rights and the dignity of every man—both rich and poor. If we swept every Communist out of America today, tomorrow we would still have slums, substandard living, occupational diseases, and the millions whose educational, social and political rights are violated. Communism is not responsible for these evils. Let's face the cause and condemn it and work to correct it.—*From the SOCIAL ACTION BULLETIN, Diocese of Hartford, Conn., January 15, 1947.*

UNESCO and Its Possibilities

LOUIS J. A. MERCIER

LET me say at once that we must pay tribute to the zeal and goodwill of those who gradually developed the idea of such a body and planned its constitution. It should first be emphasized, however, that UNESCO is still merely a plan, that as yet it does not exist. It will exist only when its constitution has been accepted by the governments of twenty nations (Art. XV). It must, for instance, be approved by the Congress before it is formally accepted by the United States.

As Mr. William Burton, Assistant Secretary of State put it: "UNESCO has a Constitution. It has a Preparatory Commission. But it is still only a document, a piece of paper." As Mr. MacLeish expressed it: "It is like a kite lying on the ground. It has yet to rise."

It is, however, easy to study the making and the make-up of this kite, thanks to two 1946 pamphlets published by the State Department, called: "The Defenses of Peace, Documents relating to UNESCO."

What then were the steps that led to the formulation of the plan for UNESCO?

It had forerunners between the two world-wars, private ones such as the International Council of Scientific

An address delivered at the Institute for Study of the United Nations Charter, Mundelein College, Chicago, Ill., October 23, 1946. Professor Mercier is Professor of Comparative Philosophy and Literature at Georgetown University, and Emeritus of Harvard University.

Unions, the International Union of Academies, the International Federation of University Women, all founded in 1919. In 1922, intergovernmental action began with the establishment of an International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation. In 1924, this Committee was settled in Paris and recognized as an autonomous technical organ of the League by the Assembly in 1926-31. This Committee still exists, but it is expected to disband when UNESCO comes into operation.

The first definite step toward the development of UNESCO itself was the organization of a Conference by the Ministers of Education of the governments in exile in London in 1942. Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland and Yugoslavia were represented. In 1943, China, the United States, the Soviet Union, the four

British Dominions and India sent observers. In April, 1944, an American Education Delegation, with Senator Fulbright as chairman, went to London to canvass with the Conference the possibilities of international action.

Here we really have the start of the UNESCO project, for at a meeting sponsored jointly by the Ministers' Conference and the American group, proposals were drawn up for a United Nations agency for educational and cultural reconstruction. The immediate aim was to study how to restore the educational and cultural facilities destroyed by the Axis powers, but the draft also provided that this joint conference should take the necessary steps "to create an international organization dedicated to the proposition that the free and unrestricted education of the peoples of the world and the unrestricted interchange between them of ideas and knowledge are essential to the preservation of security and peace."

Here is the embryonic draft of what were to be the aims of UNESCO: free and unrestricted education, and unrestricted interchange of ideas and knowledge.

After this 1944 meeting, the United States remained in relation with the Conference of Ministers of Education, as a cooperating nation, with a consultant of the Department of State stationed in London for that purpose.

However, UNESCO was still far from being developed. The idea was

still primarily that of a temporary reconstruction agency. But events were stimulating minds. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization was set up in the summer of 1944, and the Charter of the United Nations was formulated, on the basis of the October, 1944, Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and signed at San Francisco in June, 1945.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

At Dumbarton, an advance was made from the idea of national co-operation purely for political security to that of the promotion of "human welfare as an essential element in the establishment of peace." To this effect an Economic and Social Council was proposed.

This was not as yet to mention cultural relations specifically; but, evidently, an Economic and Social Council, scheduled to work "through specialized agencies in various fields of cooperation in close relationship with the general United Nations Organization" offered a way to work in the educational and cultural fields under the United Nations.

The United States Department of State began to investigate these possibilities, with the help of specialists, on the basis of the tentative draft-constitution brought back from London in 1944; and, after three months, a draft constitution for an International Organization for Educational and Cultural Cooperation emerged.

This draft was presented to the conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London in April, 1945, together with the proposals and comments of more than twenty other governments of the United Nations.

In the course of the summer, the sponsoring governments at the San Francisco Conference accepted a proposal of the Chinese Government "that educational and cultural relations be specifically included among the matters with which the U.N.O. should concern itself." The consultant group of the U. S. delegation at once supported this move, and felt that the matter should be specified in the U.N.O. charter. Resolutions introduced in the House and in the Senate in May on the general desirability of the creation of an international cultural organization gave impetus to the project.

Finally, in articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter drawn up at San Francisco, specific reference was made to "educational and cultural cooperation."

UNESCO was about to become a reality, at least as a definite project. The French delegation proposed "that the members of the United Nations should convene a special conference to draw up a statute for an International Organ on Cultural Cooperation." It was decided to hold this conference in London in November, 1945, and one month before the Conference of Allied Ministers of Edu-

cation released the text of a proposed draft, based upon the work of the London Conference of 1944.

Under the leadership of the State Department, a United States delegation was named, and leaders of learned and cultural associations studied the draft as advisers to that delegation. It was headed by Mr. Archibald MacLeish, former Assistant Secretary of State, and consisted of seven members, nine advisers, six technical experts, and about ten secretaries and assistants, plus a stenographic and clerical staff. It held five meetings in Washington before leaving for London and met twice a day through the conference period.

Representatives of more than forty of the United Nations attended this conference of November, 1945. They took the final step for the launching of UNESCO by drawing up the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. And since this constitution was to become effective only when twenty governments had formally accepted it through their legislative bodies, a condition the U. S. delegation insisted on, provision had to be made for the interim. A Preparatory Educational, Scientific and Cultural Commission was therefore set up, and today this Commission is still all there is of UNESCO. It will be the duty of this Commission to draw up the agenda of the first con-

ference of UNESCO when its Constitution has been ratified by twenty nations. It was also decided that the headquarters of UNESCO would be in Paris, though provision was made for holding general sessions of the organization at other places from year to year.

AIMS OF THE CONSTITUTION

It was necessary to sketch the steps which led to the Constitution of UNESCO, now in the trust of the Preparatory Commission, if only to bring out that this constitution is the outcome of a long incubation fostered by high-minded men representing what might well be the highest intelligentsia of the present world.

What thoughts, what ideals were then uppermost in the minds of these men? It is easy to discover this, because repeatedly the same terms are used in the preliminary reports, in the discussions and in the final constitution, all recorded in the State Department's pamphlets mentioned as my authorities.

We already saw that the first London Conference of 1942 reached the formula: "free and unrestricted education and unrestricted interchange of ideas and knowledge." This ideal was to remain basic, but it was bound to become more specifically expressed.

It must be recalled that the Constitution of UNESCO was written less than three months after the revelation of the power of the atomic

bomb. So those who worked to formulate its aims could realize that the day might come when in a few hours all the great centers of the world would be obliterated.

Scanning through the various statements in, and concerning, the Constitution of UNESCO, we get such expressions of ideals and hopes as the following, which I report on exhaustively so that you may judge at once both the extent and the limitations of the UNESCO's pattern for peace: "promote a climate of mutual understanding and mutual trust," "combat ignorance and mistrust," "use the weapons of enlightenment and mutual comprehension," "international mistrust is a mortal danger to mankind, international understanding a practical and immediate necessity."

Most of these sentences are taken from the Report of the Secretary of State by Mr. MacLeish, Chairman of the U. S. Delegation. The State Department pamphlets at hand also give selected quotations from the addresses at the Conference.

"In the new world order toward which we are moving," said the Prime Minister of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Mr. Attlee, "we need machinery to deal with each of the major fields of human activity . . . such as labor, health, food, agriculture, transport, finance . . . as instruments of our cooperative international life"; but we must include "that large

and significant field of activity which can be described broadly as the life of the mind . . . Wars begin in the minds of men. Today, the peoples of the world do not understand each other's history, each other's way of life, each other's way of thinking . . ." The more they shall come to do so, the more "they will realize how much they have in common, and why and how they differ, the less prone will they be to take up arms against each other."

Again and again, throughout the UNESCO Conference deliberation, recurred the expression of this faith that if men come to know one another better, if they perfect their understanding of one another, they will avoid war.

In fact only three other purposes appear to have been prominent in the minds of the framers of the Constitution of UNESCO:

1. The encouragement of popular education . . . on the basis of "equality of educational opportunity, without regard to race, sex, or any distinctions, economic or social."

2. "The conservation and protection of the world's inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science."

3. "Cooperation among the nations in all branches of intellectual activity," including exchange of personnel, publications, art and scientific objects, and other materials of information.

Such is the whole substance of the

UNESCO's program. Mr. MacLeish himself summed it up in his Report to the Secretary of State in these words:

The over-all purpose of UNESCO is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture. . . . The functions through which this purpose is to be realized are three: first, the advancement of the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples through all the media of mass communication, notably the press, the radio, and the motion picture; second, the encouragement of popular education by collaboration with the member states in their educational activities; and, third, cooperation with the members states in the preservation of the world's inheritance of materials of knowledge, and in the promotion of the increase and diffusion of knowledge in all branches of intellectual activity.

We have evidently in this, one ideal and aim distinct from that of increasing peoples' knowledge of one another, namely that of encouraging popular education everywhere, irrespective of race, sex, economic and social conditions; but the common protection of the cultural resources and monuments, and intellectual cooperation through exchange of personnel and production may be considered part of the program of greater knowledge of one another on the part of all nations.

I was requested not only to give you some idea of the development and program of UNESCO, but to make some general comments on the issues it raises.

This is evidently more difficult. Again, I would like to pay tribute to the earnestness and prolonged and many-sided labor of the men who worked out the plan of UNESCO; but the machinery they set up is so ambitious in its appeal for world-concerted action, that they must be the first to welcome the reactions of any who, like them, understand that we must learn to cooperate internationally in every field of endeavor, if we do not wish to see the day when, in a few hours, we may annihilate one another.

HUMAN REALITIES

The danger in all schemes of human betterment is that we shall let our sentiments blind us as to human realities, or to objective reality in general.

This, in fact, in the history of the whole 19th century which ended in the catastrophe of two world wars. All through that century we find sentimental aspirations toward human progress, and sentimental assurances that we would reach it. The Romantics believed that we would do so on the basis of the reassertion of the essential goodness of man; the naturalists, who followed them, believed that we would do so thanks to scientific progress and a scientific approach to the solution of all the problems of life. They both believed, and the 19th century intelligentsia, on the whole, believed with them that this would the more surely come to pass because

we had discarded the religious tradition which has shaped the Western world, in favor of sentimental or scientific humanitarianism, or complete secularism.

If you open the Century Dictionary, you may read that the philosophical meaning of humanitarianism is "the doctrine that mankind may become perfect without divine aid," and also "the doctrine that benevolence and philanthropy forms the sum of men's duties." As an example the Century quotes from L. F. Ward's *Dynamic Sociology II*, 450: "Humanitarianism aims at the reorganization of society, so that all shall possess equal advantages for gaining a livelihood and contributing to the welfare of society." Secularism is defined as "Exclusive attention to the present life and its duties," and a secularist as: "One who theoretically rejects or ignores all forms of religious faith and worship, established on the authority of Revelation, and accepts only facts and influences which are derived from the present life; one who maintains that public education and other matters of civil policy should be conducted without the introduction of a religious element."

Now, I am sorry to have to say that the more I study the Constitution and the proceedings that led to the Constitution of UNESCO, the more convinced I become that we have here a purely humanitarian and secular document, that it calls on us to con-

tinue to live in the mirage of the 19th century which led to two world wars, and that consequently its provisions are totally inadequate to help prevent another world war.

Not only is there nowhere in its Constitution, nor was there anywhere in its deliberations, according to the available records, a mention of the name of God as in our Declaration of Independence, but there is no mention of the Christian churches, or any intention manifested of cooperating with them, or of calling upon them to cooperate with UNESCO. In Part II of the State Department's pamphlet, we read: "UNESCO is to be a star of the first magnitude in the new world constellation of the United Nations. It will also be a sun around which a system of great world associations both public and private will cluster, shedding and receiving both light and warmth." And further: "The London Conference also considered the relation of UNESCO to the planetary bodies which, it was foreseen, would gather around it in a solar system of educational, cultural and scientific organizations of all kinds."

So there is repeated, and even florid mention, of calling upon all types of learned societies in all nations for their cooperation, and repeated assurances of cooperation with them; but there is nowhere a recognition that the churches are also part of the civilizing and cultural assets of the world, with which there must be cooperation

if there is not to be opposition. As presently planned, UNESCO with its platform of undiluted secularism could well become the greatest adversary of Christianity and the greatest promulgator of practical atheism yet let loose on the world.

Nor is it difficult to point out that the provisions for action envisaged by UNESCO have all the inadequacy inherent in the humanitarian secularism which, refusing to recognize the objective reality of God's order and of the real nature of man, is forever lured into dreams of Arcadias in which men will fraternize in their supposed natural goodness, as soon as they have the proper secular institutions and are secularly educated.

We have seen that there are really only two propositions in the program of UNESCO: the spread of popular education irrespective of race, sex or economic and social distinctions, and the repeated expression of the faith that if men come to know one another through mass communication, the press, the radio, the motion picture, and through exchange and intercourse of secular cultural personnel, they will avoid war.

Now, the world-wide spread of popular education irrespective of racial, economic and social distinctions is certainly a generous ideal, but it is also certainly a large order, since in our own United States we are still far from having generally achieved it. When, moreover, we consider the

economic status of what has been estimated to be two-thirds of the world's population, a status at the level of malnutrition, even ever close to possible famine, we may see that it may take centuries before the ideal of high standards of education can be realized throughout the world. Furthermore, we should reflect that it can be realized only through the development of local abundant wealth which means the development of a high production through scientific industry in all countries; for a community or a government cannot develop a general education system without the taxes which industrial production alone permits. If we have a high development of education in our Northern States, it is because of our high industrialism. The Southern States as yet simply cannot produce the revenue for it, and in the Caribbean area, and largely in South America, the Churches and the governments remain comparatively helpless, because of the lack of financial resources due to a low or non-existent industrial production.

I had occasion to study conditions in a small Caribbean country last year. I was amazed to see that out of a population of some three millions about two millions and a half were illiterate. Who was to blame, the Church, the government, or both? Really neither. They were both doing their best to better conditions. But the total revenue of the government in recent years was only between three

and six millions. That is no more than an average-size American city spends on a few of its services. New York State spends about three hundred and fifty millions for the education of about two million children.

Evidently in such a country and in many South American countries, in Africa and in Asia, before you could raise the level of education of the masses in general, you would have to develop huge industries and provide for exports. Moreover many of those countries have no natural resources to permit such a development. To raise their education level they would need continued gifts of foreign capital, since even we are talking about the necessity of subsidizing nationally education in our Southern States.

BASIS OF HOPE

So, even admitting the principle that every human being should get all the education of which he is capable, and granting that secular education means necessarily a rise in moral standards, a fact by the way which 19th century history belies, the proclaimed aim of raising the standards of secular education throughout the world is not one which may be considered attainable soon enough to save us, or our immediate descendants, from another war.

But the hope placed by UNESCO in the principle that if men come to know one another better through mass

communications, and secular personal exchanges, they shall be saved from war, is no less fallacious.

It would indeed be wonderful if all that was necessary to avoid war was that the people got to know one another better. Unfortunately, the very opposite is necessarily true unless the people concerned are of one mind to begin with. If, on the contrary, they hold contradictory ideals and aims, the more they come to know one another, the more they will dislike one another, and the closer they will be to war. Our dislike for the Nazis certainly grew as we came to know them better.

What basis of hope is there then for the nations if they hold contradictory ideals and aims? There is only one, namely, that they come to recognize that there is, above them all, a righteousness, a universal moral law, a natural law flowing from their God-given nature, according to which their several ideals and aims are to be judged. Peace can be achieved only by a common acceptance of that righteousness. Men will have to be linked by a common thought before they can be linked into a common world.

But there is no reason why that common thought should be the thought of any one particular nation as such. American thought as such is not necessarily superior to German thought. It is superior only if it conforms better than German thought to an objective reality, an antecedent and

transcendent moral order above both Germans and Americans. If there is no such objective transcendent morality, then we cannot escape war to settle whose thought, whose aims, whose likes and dislikes are to prevail. If there is no law above us all, then the superior might of one will become the law.

So the way to escape war is not merely to get to know one another better, or our past histories better, as UNESCO proposes; for we are all likely to be or to have been more or less at fault. Nations should of course get to know one another better, but this increased intercourse must have for its aim to get to understand what is the common law above them all, to acknowledge one and all how they may have been or are violating it, and to unite in a common resolve to find ways to live henceforth according to its dictates.

It must therefore be considered profoundly disappointing that such an array of intellectuals as labored on UNESCO did not reach back, in the light of the bitter experience of two world wars, at least to the principles which inspired the Founding Fathers of this nation.

Jefferson did not content himself with some vague words about "the democratic principles of the dignity, equality, and mutual respect of men," or "the moral solidarity of mankind," the only two phrases in the Constitution of UNESCO which hint at prin-

ciples. He still realized that man's dignity, equality, respectability, and possible solidarity with his fellows was due to his God-given nature. Jefferson understood that men had inalienable rights only because their first allegiance was to God, their Creator, so that they had the right to worship Him, and the duty to live according to the relations between men, and between men and God which constitute His justice, even against whatsoever a ruler, an oligarchy, a comintern, or a democratic majority might decree. Even the pagan Greeks had glimpsed that truth, as proved by Antigone's immortal words to the tyrant Creon: "Nor did I think your proclamations had so much power, since you are a mortal, to transgress the unwritten and immovable laws of the gods. For they are not of yesterday, but eternally they live."

SECULARISM OF UNESCO

Nor did the Founding Fathers of this nation fail to recognize, as does UNESCO, the necessity of allowing the churches to make their contribution to the progress of civilization, and of utilizing that contribution. "Let us unite," prayed Washington, "in imploring the Supreme Ruler of nations to spread His holy protection over these United States . . . to verify the anticipation of this government being a safeguard to human rights." And James Madison added: "It is our aim to avoid the slightest inter-

ference with the right of conscience or the function of religion so wisely exempted from civil jurisdiction."

We cannot therefore but stand appalled at the decadence of Western thought since the days of Washington, Jefferson and Madison, as represented by the secularism of UNESCO.

Nor is Russia to be blamed for it. We may recognize the contribution made by Russia to the defeat of Nazism, and yet venture to say that UNESCO's plea for freedom of communication between peoples would not have had her blessing. Russia did not take part in the conference which led to the formulation of UNESCO's Constitution. This Constitution is the child chiefly of the Western powers. If it is a secularist document, it is because our Western intelligentsia long ago embraced secularism, and still gives it its trust, in spite of the fact that two world wars are there to prove what 19th century secularism has led to.

Now we might ask: What can we do about it? It has been suggested that I say a word about the possibilities of Catholic lay cooperation with UNESCO. As Catholics, we would have to say that there is really no assured hope for peace without the recognition of the need of God's grace through Jesus Christ, because there is no hope that, without that grace, men may live according to justice. But this supernaturalism of ours would be dismissed at once as resting

upon a faith in a Revelation which many do not share, and hence which cannot become the ground of a common accord.

Is there then no ground upon which the modern world can come together? There undoubtedly is, because the existence of God and of His moral law can be established, or at least recognized, by unaided reason. Of the greatest significance on this point are the pronouncements of His Holiness Pope Pius XII in his Christmas allocutions of 1939, 1941 and 1942. After recalling that grace through Jesus Christ "is diffused in all hearts," he added: In the present plight of the world, "we turn to all those who are united with us at least by the bond of faith in God . . . Such social intercourse and the new order we are hoping for, may be founded on that immovable and unshakable rock, the moral law, which the Creator Himself manifested in a natural order."

NATURAL MORAL LAW

We can hardly overestimate the importance of this Papal assurance that the natural moral law is at least a possible and legitimate basis for the development of a common will to that social justice which alone can insure peace. As a Jesuit commentator on these allocutions of Pope Pius XII explains: "On the one hand, the co-operation of all men of good will is a spiritual objective, because it involves a return to the principles of justice

and charity made mandatory by God's law." On the other hand, it remains strictly within "the temporal or natural order . . . it does not extend into the realm of religious worship, ecclesiastical faith and order . . . because it conceives the establishment of the principles of the natural law as the basis of man's political, economic, and social life in this world."

Here, I believe, is where we must take our stand in relation to UNESCO. As Catholics, we cannot hope to save the situation alone. But in these allocutions of Pope Pius XII, we have a directive which points out how we may work with others. Fortunately, we have already learned in this country to cooperate with others, and others have learned to cooperate with us in the field of social relations. Catholics, Protestants and Jews have already proved that they can work together for social and international justice.

This was signally proved by the elaboration of a Pattern for Peace by representative leaders of the three religious groups in 1943. This pattern for peace is immensely superior to that of UNESCO because, as opposed to its secularism, it recalls that, back of the Christian understanding of the Redemption, there may be common beliefs in the existence of God the Creator, in the distinct nature He gave to man, and in the moral law which binds men to God and to one another, because of that nature. So the

Inter-Faith Peace Pattern did not waste its time in vague words about a human solidarity which must remain a delusion if it is not based on the rock of faith in the fatherhood of God. It declared boldly that "the organization of a just peace depends upon the practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals, but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God, and to the moral law which comes from God."

From this, it deduced a practical program for peace infinitely larger than that of UNESCO. With the dignity of the human person grounded on its relation to God, it called for "an international declaration of rights," and "upon states as well as individuals to repudiate racial, religious, and other discriminations, in violation of those rights." It called further for the recognition of "the rights of minorities to life, education, and the vote," for "the international safeguarding of the rights of all peoples whether large or small, within the framework of collective security, while colonial peoples, instead of being exploited, must be helped toward political responsibility."

It also demands that, instead of economic monopoly, and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups or states, we have "an international economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens."

Finally, it asks that, within each state, "steps be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare." To work at all this, it asserts that we must have "some organization of international institutions," but it proclaims more forcefully that this organization must be based "on a body of international law, itself based on the natural law."

This Inter-Faith Peace Pattern was represented at the San Francisco Conference which set up the United Nations Organization. No doubt the presence of its representatives accounts partly for the fact that the Charter of the United Nations at least refers to "principles of justice and international law," to "the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples," to "the respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all," and to the need of "the progressive development of international law and of its codification."

INSERTIONS IN THE CONSTITUTION

There is no statement in the Constitution of the United Nations as to the ultimate basis of the principles mentioned, but at least there is a recognition of a law above individuals and nations, and our representatives

at the Peace Conference just adjourned may be credited with having stood by those principles.

My suggestion would be that the Conference of Catholics, Protestants and Jews now take up the matter of UNESCO, and see to it that it be invited to recognize the principles outlined in the Pattern for Peace. UNESCO is an instrument of the United Nations Organization. We need to be reassured as to its action in its own field.

I would therefore say that it is essential that there be inserted into the Constitution of UNESCO two additional paragraphs:

1. UNESCO recognizes that a just peace depends upon the practical recognition that not only the aims and actions of individuals but of nations, states, and international society are to be judged by a law of universal justice, a moral law antecedent to and above them all, and that education and a greater understanding and intercourse among all peoples is to be promoted, first of all, in order that they may all, the more surely, adjust their aims and actions to that law.

2. UNESCO proposes to cooperate with, and seek the cooperation of every type of cultural group, including the churches.

Behind the demand for the insertion of two such clauses, we must marshall the influence not only of Catholics, but the united effort of all those who believe in the natural law.

There is no doubt that among those who framed the Constitution of UNESCO there are some who would be the first to welcome that demand, which, after all, is but a call to return to the principles of the Founders of this Republic. UNESCO's Constitution is now not only futile but a menace, because it is a purely naturalistic document. It must be made, and Catholics, Protestants and Jews must unite to help make it, at least the expression of the natural ethics elaborated by the reason of the Western world since the Greeks, and which Jewish and Christian writings but confirm and amplify.

Mr. MacLeish is credited with saying that UNESCO as yet is like a kite lying on the ground, that it has yet to rise.

Well, a kite cannot rise unless it has a stabilizing tail. All I have tried to submit is that this stabilizing tail must be the assertion of the natural moral law, and a spirit of cooperation with all the agencies, including the churches, which work for the elucidation and the promulgation of that law.

This is no exclusively Catholic platform. It is not even a Christian platform. It does not even insist, as well it might, upon asserting that the natural law comes from God. It merely recalls that through reason, and the experience of the race, we may distinguish a moral order, an order of justice, a code of inalienable rights and universal duties to which we must

adapt, through world institutions and courts, our individual and national behaviors; and that all institutions which stand for this moral order are to be recognized and cooperated with.

Short of this, there is only the alternative of the recently developed naturalistic conception that men make their own law according to their power; and, on that principle, the more we shall come to know one another, the more bitter will be our struggles; the more education we shall have, the greater will be our power of destruction.

Short of this there can only be a continuation of contradictory imperialisms, and, eventually, that fearful atomic war which will mean our annihilation, and which UNESCO itself was designed to help prevent.

We certainly need UNESCO, but we must have a UNESCO which definitely recognizes those immovable laws of which Antigone spoke, and on which the Western world was built, which are not of today or of yesterday but live eternally, and which men must obey if they are to progress, or, as we must say now, even survive.

Not by Law Alone

The popular trend, arising from short-lived indignation over strikes and work stoppages, is to rush to the law for a remedy. To disregard the need of reasonable restraint by law of labor union activities would be to promote *laissez faire* in unions after it has been discontinued by business. On the other hand, to overestimate the effectiveness of law to the detriment of education may increase rather than remedy the mischief. To be effective, collective bargaining ultimately depends on good faith, cooperation and "living together" from day to day by management and labor. The atmosphere of the law court, of law suits, will be as conducive to the increase of mutual respect and trust and "harmonious living together" fifty-two weeks in the year by labor and management as it would be in the case of the mutual respect and love of husband and wife. A wife may sue the husband or vice versa. But then—do not expect them to live together afterward in peace and harmony.—*Thomas E. Shortell in THOUGHT, December, 1946.*

THE EDITORIAL MIND

Tax Program

WE HAVE read and shall continue to read much about tax reduction, balancing the Federal budget, and payment of public debt. President Truman has spoken against the lifting of excise taxes, and most people will agree with him, except those who are engaged in the selling of liquor and luxuries.

Little sympathy can be felt toward the pleas to reduce excise taxes. Such taxes are easily collected and they are not imposed on essential items. People who want to buy jewelry and liquor, or who wish to travel on airplanes and trains, have raised little objection to the extra taxes.

The emphasis in these times of prosperity should be placed not on simply balancing the budget, but on the payment of debt. If a tax reduction is possible while paying the public debt, it should be in the low-income brackets, where the burden of taxation is felt most. Reducing taxes in the low-income brackets would help to keep down the demands of labor for increases in wages. Such a policy of tax reduction, together with a positive effort on the part of business to reduce costs of foods and gen-

eral commodities, will halt the rising spiral of wage demands.

The public debt is 260 billion dollars. The interest load of this debt alone runs into the billions. The quickest way to bring our economy back to normal lies not merely in balancing the budget and in lightening the interest load, but also in paying off the principal of the debt and thereby eliminating continued interest burdens.—THE CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH-REGISTER, Cincinnati, Ohio, Jan. 17, 1947.

The Polish "Election"

THE COMMUNISTS are crowing over their victory in the Polish elections. On the face of it they have a right to crow. They swept the elections by a margin of 10 to 1. But was it a victory? Or was it a brutal conquest? The verdict of the democratic world is nearly unanimous. It was just another conquest by the power of tyranny, a denial by force of the real desires of the majority of Poland's citizens. That sort of pinchbeck imitation victory offers no guarantee of genuine peace to Poland. It is, rather, the foundation of future bloody conflict within

Poland, already wracked and torn as no nation has been in centuries.

In a free election, most unbiased observers are agreed, the Communist regime would have been swept from office by a 2 to 1 vote. But the election was far from free. In fact it was even more fraudulent and farcical than the recent elections in the Balkans. It demonstrated every form of criminal control of the balloting that ever has been discovered by politicians without morals and without conscience. The Communist gentry, in their efforts to bring about a "vote of loyalty" to the regime, used such gentle weapons as murder, beatings and sluggings and other forms of police terrorism, slashings of the voters' lists to eliminate known or suspected opposition, censorship of opposing opinion, suppression of candidates and a score of methods wholly repugnant to democratic feelings.

Yet the Communists crow about the election and boast of it as a famous victory. No doubt the half-million Russian soldiers within the borders of Poland rejoiced, too. They are now assured that they can continue to trample the country under their booted feet for an indefinite time in the future. Poland is now a part of the Communist conspiracy to kill off democracy, even though her people are mostly hostile to Communism.

What the American government will do about this fraud against the real spirit of Poland we do not know.

Perhaps nothing. But it would be a shame if the money of the American people were used in further loans, or indeed in any form of financial aid, to a regime whose very existence is a testimonial to the foul methods and equally foul purposes of the Communist party. — THE CATHOLIC TRANSCRIPT, *Hartford, Conn.*, Jan. 23, 1947.

Bulwark of Morality

THE Catholic Church has always voiced its uncompromising condemnation of contraception, because such a practice is inherently immoral. Hence, she must, quite logically, also condemn the dissemination of information on ways and means to practice such wrong-doing.

That positive, unyielding refusal of the Church to approve any such practices have brought upon her much vilification and abuse, but that makes not a particle of difference. Now a resolution circulated by the National Clergymen's Advisory Council of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America blames "minority religious groups" for preventing hospitals, nursing and welfare agencies of this country from providing birth-control advice, which is characterized as "essential service."

One dismal feature about this resolution, among several, is the fact that it is supposed to have been signed by 3,300 Protestant and Jewish clergy-

men. Of course, as Rev. Dr. Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., points out in an answer to the resolution, no mention is made of the many non-Catholic clergymen who do not accept that type of distorted ethics. Nevertheless, it is depressing to note that so many who claim to be religious teachers should promote practices that are so patently contrary to God's law.

Catholics should certainly find consolation and inspiration in the stand of their Church, by striking contrast, as the unyielding champion of God's law. The Catholic Church will never yield in these fields (Faith and morals), regardless of popular fancy, to fads of the day or new attitudes. This situation and this resolution make us realize too that the Catholic Church remains the sole religious bulwark of a sound, unchanging code of morals. Neither vilification nor abuse will ever induce her to stoop to expediency to meet the clamor or the fancy of the day.—*CATHOLIC ACTION OF THE SOUTH, New Orleans, La., Dec. 5, 1946.*

Dedication of Family Life

TWO GREAT orders of priests are striving always for the formal dedication of the family to Christ through a simple but beautiful act of consecration. The Order of the Fathers of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary and the Jesuit Fathers are extremely active in this

work. Central in the ceremony is the placing of a picture of the Sacred Heart in a conspicuous place and the recitation of prayers and ritual with a parish priest as leader. Under some conditions, the head of the family may substitute for the priest.

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph stand as a model for all families, and our Lord Himself is, of course, the central Figure. Yet He proved Himself representative of the ideal child by making Himself, the Creator, subject to His own chosen parents. Mary and Joseph, the perfect parents, and Jesus, the perfect child, stand as the inspiring models for all to imitate.

In these modern times it would seem that the least every Catholic should do is to have a picture of the Sacred Heart and other reminders of the meaning of family love and devotion conspicuously displayed in the home.

Priests making the annual visitation frequently are disappointed at the absence of holy pictures in living rooms. Too often there are woodland scenes, ships in distress, and animal pictures adorning the walls that should be decorated with constant reminders that the inhabitants of the home are Catholics.

The present plight of thousands of families torn by dissension is well known. It is to be doubted that many of these families ever were dedicated to the Sacred Heart of our Lord or patterned their existence upon the

Holy Family. Perhaps an act of consecration, a holy picture, a regular period of devotion, at least the family beads by the parents before a picture of the Sacred Heart, may save a home otherwise doomed to destruction. — THE PROVIDENCE VISITOR, Providence, R. I., Jan. 9, 1947.

Nationalization

EFFORTS of certain politicians to make political capital out of the Pope's words on nationalization, in his letter last summer to the French *Semaine Sociale*, have led the authoritative Roman review, *Civiltà Cattolica*, to present an exposition of the social teaching of the church on nationalization, showing that Catholic teaching is not opposed to it. The essence of the *Civiltà Cattolica* article can be summed up in six propositions, as follows:

1. The Church does not condemn nationalization as such, but condemns only its excesses.

2. The nationalization of industry is in certain cases not only permissible but opportune.

3. In general it is proper for the State to nationalize certain industries, particularly those which, in the hands of private capitalism, would constitute a means of exploitation or which would be contrary to the common good.

4. Nationalization is not the only

nor the primary means which the State has at its disposal for giving collective property a social function and placing it at the service of the common good.

5. Excessive nationalization runs the danger of accentuating, instead of mitigating, the mechanical character of life and work in common.

6. The issue is not one only of regulating the production and distribution of wealth, but also of guaranteeing the dignity and independence of the human person against all oppression, both political and economic, whether it comes from private capitalism or the State.

Pope Pius in his letter to the *Semaine Sociale* emphasized particularly point five above, pointing out for the rest that the moral aspect of nationalization had been treated elsewhere by him and his predecessors. The Pope's words were seized upon and interpreted in certain circles in France as a Papal condemnation of nationalization. This interpretation was used as the basis for broadsides which were distributed about France, attacking the nationalization policies advocated among others by the Popular Republican Movement (MRP). The fact that *Civiltà Cattolica* has chosen to answer these efforts marks them as a political maneuver without foundation. — THE CATHOLIC MIRROR, Springfield, Mass., January, 1947.

Organized Labor in the United States

BENJAMIN L. MASSE, S.J.

Reprinted from SERVICO SOCIAL*

THE history of trade unionism in the United States can be traced back to the earliest days of the Republic. The first unions were small and composed exclusively of craftsmen, some of whom were self-employed. With the extension of the railroads to the West in the middle of the last century, Eastern industry found a national market for its goods. To the union leaders of that day it was immediately evident that they could not protect the living standards of their followers on a local or regional basis. If industry was to be national in scope, then labor would have to become national, too. And so in the decade immediately preceding the Civil War was born the first national labor union, the Iron Molders' International.

For the next seventy-five years the history of trade unionism is a dismal story of bitter, uphill struggle, struggle against employers, the press, local, State and national governments, even against the Courts, for the elemental right to organize. During periods of prosperity the unions increased in size, but in the depressions which always followed members fell away like leaves in the autumn, and the last stage was little better than the first.

When Franklin Roosevelt became President in 1933, only about two million workers were organized in the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods and scattered independent unions, and these were mostly skilled craftsmen. In the huge basic industries, which had come to dominate the American economy, unionism was almost non-existent.

This discouraging picture was quickly changed with the advent of the Roosevelt Administration. For the first time in the history of the country, with the exception of special legislation for railway workers, the government supported the natural right of workingmen to free association. On July 5, 1935, President Roosevelt signed the National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act). Sometimes called labor's *Magna Charta*, this act protects the right to organize and imposes on employers the duty of bargaining with the freely chosen representatives of their employes. At first resisted by many industrialists, who hoped for salvation from the Supreme Court, the Act was declared constitutional in 1937, and by now, despite demands for revision, is quite generally accepted. Under it organized labor has grown in little

* Rua São Carlos do Pinhal, 57, São Paulo, S. P., Brazil, September, 1946

more than a decade from two million to approximately fifteen million. Labor has arrived.

The long struggle to achieve a recognized legal status in the American economy has not, however, solved all the problems of organized labor. At the present moment, following the strike wave after V-J Day, labor is under heavy attack and there are widespread demands on Congress for disciplinary legislation. The causes of this unrest are complex and there is no simple solution to any of them. The following discussion may throw a little light on four of the more prominent difficulties.

I.

DEMOCRACY AND DISCIPLINE

The American labor movement has reached large proportions and is consequently heir to all the problems which go with bigness. One of these, which is especially acute at the moment, consists in the old difficulty of reconciling democracy and discipline. Everyone agrees that labor unions, like other organized groups in society, must assume responsibilities commensurate with their status and power. In return for fair wages and hours, they must see to it that their members give an honest day's work, and that all collective bargaining contracts are faithfully lived up to. This means that union leaders must demand of the rank and file a certain amount of discipline and that they

must be ready to punish recalcitrants. In a democratic organization, it is not always easy to do this. After all, the officers hold their positions only by grace of the members and, human nature being what it is, there are always demagogues ready to capitalize on the complaints of malcontents. While labor's record in observing contracts is generally good, there is just enough irresponsibility to provide ammunition for its enemies. In such circumstances, a strong leader may be seriously tempted to overlook democratic processes and rule with a dictatorial hand.

The temptation to do this is increased by the very bigness of unionism and the complexity of the problems with which it must deal. Every large American union has to maintain a bureaucracy, which includes not merely organizers, but publicity experts, economists, lawyers and statisticians. These people are not elected to office, although they have a great deal of influence. Without them it would be impossible to carry on collective bargaining, which has now become a very technical and elaborate process. Under these conditions, unless the officers are firmly determined to maintain the democratic traditions of organized labor, trade unionism tends to become a movement *for* the workers but not *of* and *by* the workers.

The growing interest in labor education gives substance to the hope that

the trade unions may find the answers to both these problems and thus avoid large-scale state interference in their affairs.

II.

THE JURISDICTIONAL STRIKE

A second cause of public disapproval is the jurisdictional strike. Since 1938, the main body of American labor has been split into two hostile groups, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Originally the division took place over a conflict between craft unionism and industrial unionism, but this source of dissension can no longer be considered a major factor. In any number of cases, the AFL and CIO compete in organizing workers and the choice is between AFL and CIO, not between craft and industrial unionism. Occasionally, too, a CIO union will shift allegiance to the AFL, and *vice versa*, with no change in its organizational structure. This competition, of course, makes for conflict, and a type of conflict which the public can understand but not approve. Even union leaders confess that there is no excuse for jurisdictional strikes, but so far they have not found a formula by which their conflicts can be settled peacefully. The result is that the innocent employer, the general public, and even fellow workers in other unions are made to suffer needlessly and unjustly.

The worst part of this problem—but not all of it, because jurisdictional conflict exists both within the CIO and the AFL—would disappear if the split in labor's ranks could be closed. Unfortunately, there does not seem to be at the present time any substantial basis for hoping that the dove of peace will descend on the divided House of Labor. The CIO and AFL are probably farther apart today than they have been at any time since the split occurred. If the rivalry continues to mount and open warfare should break out, some attempt will certainly be made to outlaw jurisdictional strikes by Federal statute. Should this happen, it will be a sign that the time has come to retire some of the present leaders of American labor.

III.

NEW ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHY

A third problem facing organized labor is the necessity of developing a new economic philosophy. Unlike trade unionism in most other countries, American labor has never been markedly ideological. This is the reason, incidentally, why the Bishops have never placed any obstacle in the way of Catholic workers who wanted to join unions. The tragic intellectual and religious conflict which divides European workers has no counterpart in the United States. If American labor has an economic philosophy at all, it is what has been

called "business unionism." Associated with the name of Samuel Gompers, who fought the attempt of Socialists to sell their philosophy to American workers, business unionism consists quite simply in the accommodation of organized workers to the economic system prevailing in the United States. Up till now American labor has not sought to destroy capitalism, although it has sponsored reforms of different kinds. It has concentrated its efforts rather on improving the wages, hours and working conditions of American labor within the existing system.

In some sections of labor today there is a tendency to question the adequacy of business unionism. The intensity and duration of the last depression, which was overcome only by the necessity of all-out production for war, has left a mark on labor thinking. Both the AFL and CIO supported the original Murray-Patman Full Employment bill, which placed on the Federal Government the obligations of dealing with mass unemployment and the boom-bust cycle. They are on record, too, as favoring a widened Social Security Act and compulsory health insurance. Going beyond these positions, which are presumed to be compatible with a system of private enterprise, some labor leaders are beginning to show as much interest in prices as in wages, and to question other traditional prerogatives of management. They are

not thinking in terms of revolution but of a change in the historical relationship between workers and management which would involve new responsibilities for labor and an approach to partnership with management. This is one of the most interesting developments in recent years and should be watched carefully. The parallel with certain passages in *Quadragesimo Anno* will be immediately apparent.

Such are the philosophical currents in the main stream of American unionism. The situation is complicated somewhat by a Communist minority, concentrated especially in the CIO, which exercises an influence far out of proportion to its size, and which is, of course, committed wholeheartedly to the interests of the Soviet Union. Once Soviet Russia was attacked by Hitler, American Communists became fulsome supporters of American capitalism and worked their heads off for all-out production. Now they have returned to their traditional revolutionary line and are becoming more of a problem every day. If the CIO and AFL could settle their differences, the Stalinists would have much less influence than they have now. While American Communists are in a position to cause considerable trouble, and must, therefore, be watched carefully and resolutely opposed, they are in no position right now to take over the American labor movement or even the CIO.

IV.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

A fourth problem concerns labor and management equally. It is the problem of assuring industrial peace, or at least of diminishing industrial strife, without slipping into the totalitarian trap of compulsory arbitration. Both industry and labor have reached such high degree of organization in the United States that a prolonged stoppage in any of a dozen major industries is bound to have serious repercussions on the whole economy. Even on the local level, some strikes are so dangerous to the safety and health of the community that it is becoming exceedingly difficult for the public to tolerate them. Yet the right to strike is one of the most cherished rights of organized labor, as the right to lockout and to resist the demands of labor is one of the most cherished rights of owners. Can this right be safely limited in a democracy?

Those who say that it cannot point to the experience of Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, and claim that only under a dictatorship can strikes be abolished. Those who argue that the right to strike ought to be limited insist that safeguards can be written into law which will prevent the state from acquiring complete domination of both labor and

management. The argument still rages, but it is a fairly safe guess that the United States will not try compulsory arbitration, even in a limited sphere, in the immediate future.

The most desirable solution to this difficulty lies in the direction of better relations between labor and management and a willingness, based on mutual trust, to submit differences to voluntary arbitration when direct negotiations have failed. In some industries this happy situation already exists. As management learns to live with unions, and as the unions forget the past hostility of employers, this mutual trust ought to develop naturally. When both labor and management agree that good morals are also good business, and when they both make room in the marketplace for religious motivation, only the details of a peaceful, cooperative relationship will remain to be settled. As in so many cases today, in the international as well as the national sphere, there can be no satisfactory answers to our problems apart from religion.

Such then in broad outline is the state of organized labor in the United States. Already trade unionism has brought rich benefits to our workers; it can better their lot still more. Whether or not it will do so depends on the success of labor leadership in solving the problems sketched above.

Religion in Liberal Education

MOST REV. RICHARD J. CUSHING, D.D.
Archbishop of Boston

Address to the Thirty-third Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges, Boston, Mass., January 13, 1947.

I MUST always speak as a priest. In so doing, however, I feel at home with you, for there is probably no profession more kindred to that of the priest than the profession of the teacher, and the bonds of mutual sympathy between the priest and the professor should, it seems to me, be many and powerful. Perhaps that mutual sympathy should be the beginning of collaboration in the kindred work of Religion and of Education for which I make a plea this evening. Perhaps we cannot expect to accomplish for some time yet much more than the development of that *sympathy* and of a mutual respect one for another, but if we accomplish at least *that*, we shall have made a great step forward over the present sad condition which too often prevails between the respective forces which you and I represent.

I refer, of course, to the condition of estrangement that sometimes exists and seems to be increasing between organized education and organized religion, between the priest (to the extent that he is a symbol of the Church) and the professor (again to the extent that he

is the symbol of the School or College). Clergy and professors usually are good friends; usually clergy are themselves scholars, at least incidentally—and not infrequently teachers and professors take their places among the most devout members of the average American community. The estrangement to which I refer is not a question of personalities or of differences between individuals; it is a question of chasms yawning between systems, systems of education and systems of thought, chasms which must somehow be bridged for the good of both religion and education, and, I might add, for the good of that democratic way of life which depends so vitally on the contributions to it that Religion and Education have to make.

I suppose it is generally conceded that Religion alone, or its product in the human person, piety, is not enough to make a complete citizen; devout and saintly souls do not always prove the most alert and effective members of the civil community. It must be equally clear that Education alone, at least in the sense of the mere transmission of

knowledge, is far from being sufficient to produce the complete citizen of democracy. Irresponsibility, flagrant disregard for the basic codes of conduct which underlie personal integrity and social order, all these, far from being limited to the uneducated, are, in fact, present in tragic degree even among the educated. It is not at all certain that marital loyalty is greater among the educated than among the simple; it is by no means certain that civic sense is more highly developed among the well educated than it is among the average members of the normal community; it is the distressing fact that international crimes are more often than not perpetrated by nations in which education is not merely generally available but is even more or less a fetish.

RELIGION IS PROSCRIBED

The recent horrible war, for example, did not start among primitive or uncouth peoples; in cold, historical fact, it was planned, pushed forward and waged by highly educated peoples, by peoples who bent their scientific and other knowledge to the criminal purposes of the greatest crime in history. Whatever else may be said of the Prussians, the Nipponese and the Soviet, no one can accuse them of neglecting education. Indeed, all three have exalted education, mere education and especially education without religion, to a level

more lofty than that of almost any modern people.

I have never been able to understand the position of those Americans who deliberately seek to isolate religion from education. We are told that education should be for *Life*, that education should be related to *living*. We are told that to live is to act, that education should therefore be related to *action*. But human action is necessarily *moral* action, and therefore education for *action*, for *living*, for *life*, should certainly include moral education. But we are told that education should be without *moral preoccupations* in a secular democracy, that at most our modern State can tolerate only a purely secular ethic; that no moral teaching in our secular schools can include elements or sanctions taught by the three thousand years of religious inspiration which are behind all our social values and our democratic institutions. Religion has not merely been *departmentalized* in the educational system of our secular society—that would be evil enough. But religion is actually *proscribed*, *ruled out*, as being without reference to the personal ends or social objectives of modern education.

Yet, if our reasoning be correct, religion, or at the very least religious morality, is indispensable to the very notion of modern education. There is no adequate morality without *religious values*; without *morality*

there is no truly *human action*. Human action embraces all *living*—and *education*, we are told, should govern living. *Education should be for life.*

But in the same breath we are told that education should be purely secular, that it should be non-religious.

This insistence that education be without religious inspiration and religious elements, even on the part of those who speak of the relationship between education and integral living, constitutes one of the most baffling contradictions of all our modern social, moral and educational thinking. It is not merely baffling; it is even *scandalous*, given some of the sources whence it comes. Every now and again one encounters in the newspapers declarations from one or another "liberal" clergyman who opposes, with no little passion and appeal to principle, the introduction of religion into education, the entrance of the Church into the field of education whether with her own schools or with an offer to collaborate with the schools of the State or other agencies.

Now there are many reasons why one might oppose certain forms of religious teaching in secular schools. One might conceivably protest it in the name of Religion itself and the desire to keep religion undefiled and undiluted. On such grounds Catholics have sometimes felt obliged to

make real reservations with regard to many proposals made for religious and moral instruction in non-religious schools. The conscientious reservations of many non-Catholics are based, I have no doubt, on like religious considerations.

But what is unintelligible to the rest of us is the opposition of those clergymen, religious leaders, who take their stand against efforts to solve the critical problems arising from the strictly non-moral character of purely secular education, whether the efforts be in terms of released time, of State aid to religious schools, or of any American adaptation of the systems prevailing in such other democracies as England, Australia or elsewhere. Such clerical opposition, usually labeled "liberal," is unintelligible not only because of its source, but also because of the premises on which it purports to be based. Almost always when proposals are made for bringing moral teaching into schools, or for collaboration between Church and School on however limited a basis, these "liberal" clergy and others assert that such proposals militate against "civil liberties" and compromise our American policy of the separation of Church and State.

We are all, I hope, sensitive to the necessity for vigilance over our civil liberties, especially in this age and day that has produced so many kinds and colors of fascism, Euro-

pean, Russian and Asiatic, Brown, Black and Red. We must be constant in our civil vigilance, constant and uncompromising. But I see no reason to believe that we are more aware of our civil liberties or better appreciative of what civil liberties are than the English people, or the Canadian people, or the Dutch, or the members of other democratic societies which have settled the issue of religious education in their schools and colleges without essential compromise of the rights of Church or State, and have done so in a spirit of collaboration, to the immense benefit of their Democracy.

CHURCH AND STATE

Similarly, we all, I think, recognize the realistic considerations which render necessary our American policy of the separation of Church and State. But I venture the opinion this evening that the alleged "Church and State" problem is being overplayed in our country at the moment. I have my own ideas as to why this is being done; this is not the place to develop them. Suffice it this evening only to state the fact as it affects education: the appeal to the American tradition of the separation of Church and State is being abused as part of the effort to block educational policies, educational programs and educational reforms which are sorely needed if Democracy is to be served by American educational institutions.

It is true that the organized State and the organized Church here in America are completely separated; it is not true that the citizen, the subject of the State, and the moral believing person, the subject of the Church, *can be separated*. Citizen and believer are blended in one personality; education fashions and perfects personality. State and Church, the forces which make for citizenship and those which make for morality, simply must find some formula under which to cooperate if education is to do its integrating work, if it is to escape becoming not merely *secular* but positively materialistic, Statist and therefore fascist. There is no way out of that dilemma. There is none known to history, none known to reason and none known to modern experience.

The extremes to which the concept of the separation of Church and State is pushed by self-styled "liberals" are particularly noticeable, I repeat, in the field of our common interest: education. These extremes are *fantastic* and *un-American*. Their typically fantastic limits must have been reached in the request made within the month for a decision now pending before the San Francisco School Board. The Civil Liberties Union wants to know if the American principle of the separation of Church and State is not violated by the singing of Christmas carols in classrooms!

One hesitates to imagine where this mentality may lead us; school boards may soon be asked to "purge" any and all courses in Dante, Chaucer, Milton, Tennyson, and, for that matter, most representative poets. In fact, if the completely secular point of view represents the ideal in these matters, then history and political science courses may have to rewrite the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and the basic documents of our political, as well as cultural, tradition.

So much of Western thought in the past twenty centuries has been impregnated with the spirit of Christianity and its God, that if it is to be banned on the ground that it is *religious teaching*, it is hard to see what there will be left to teach. The Church might not consider this to be religious teaching at all, certainly not adequate religious teaching. But a secularist might, and his appeal to the Civil Liberties Union might have far-reaching effects on the needs and the rights of the rest of the community!

The result of all this has been that our schools and colleges have lost their religious tone and content in the sense that their tone may once have been Christian. But in another direction they have very definitely acquired a "religion," and they very clearly reflect and even teach an unmistakable attitude toward religion. The "religion" of our secular col-

leges is the *religion of secularism*. For all its negative character, it has just as truly an *attitude* with regard to such religious questions as the existence and nature of God, the norms of morality, the claims of Revelation and the like, as Judaism or Christianity. While it prevents traditional religion from expressing itself in education, secularism has managed to "take over" quite completely the curricula of our elementary, secondary and collegiate levels of education. It has done so largely by invoking the American policy of the separation of Church and State, a policy which it has made the cloak and the screen of its own religious attitudes and objectives.

The distinguished American educator, Doctor Nicholas Murray Butler, once observed how the religion of secularism had managed to achieve its present exclusive hold on tax-supported schools; his observation holds for many other educational institutions where religion has been relegated for about the same reasons to some incidental place in the history of sociology courses. Doctor Butler said:

... an odd situation has been permitted to arise. The separation of Church and State is fundamental in our American political order, but so far as religious instruction is concerned, this principle has been so far departed from as to put the whole force and influence of the tax-supported school on the side of one element in the population, namely, that which

is pagan and believes in no religion whatsoever. . . . The government's indifference to religion must not be allowed to become opposition to religion.

I have called this extreme development of the idea of separation of Church and State "fantastic." I think it is also profoundly un-American. The concept of education which our Founding Fathers followed was neither indifferentist nor unreligious. The colony of Massachusetts is an example at hand. Here, in 1654, a law was passed that no one who had shown himself "unsound in the faith" was to be employed in the schools. A little later, every grammar school master had to be approved by the minister of the town and of the two adjacent towns, not, presumably, because the children of these towns would attend the school, but to make sure of the master's orthodoxy. Calvinistic training ran through the whole system, both in books and internal administration: morning and evening prayers were required in the schools and usually there were catechism classes conducted by the minister some time during the week. On Mondays pupils were asked for a summary of the Sunday sermon — summaries which doubtless called for many acts of heartfelt humility from those eminent divines.

The Calvinistic system of training was continued by the Latin schools and the academies that began to

flourish in the post-Revolutionary period. By a little stretch of terminology, it might be said that the public schools in the East were Protestant parochial schools up to the Civil War, and even later. Colleges were all sectarian, most of them schools of divinity, and Yale, as you remember, owed its early popularity to the fact that the stricter Calvinists were dissatisfied with the type of religious instruction given at Harvard. We cannot but agree that those schools and universities realized their aims better than do those same schools and universities today, that is, they came nearer to educating the whole man, nearer to imprinting on society the mark of the educated leader.

THE AMERICAN TRADITION

It is interesting also to compare and to contrast the early catalogues of Harvard University with present-day prospectuses of the same great institution or with certain parts of even so humanistic a document as the recent Report of the Harvard Committee on "General Education in a Free Society." The point is that American educators on every level, and especially on the level of the liberal arts, once recognized the essential connection between religion and morality, between morality and responsibility, between responsibility and democracy. As recently as 1939 this American tradition found expression in a program published by the

American Council on Education. It said:

To be well governed in a democratic way . . . (people) must be intellectually enlightened. But this enlightenment might prove more a bane than a boon if it is not translated into moral action. For moral action, there is only one rational basis, namely, the conviction of our accountability to the Power that gave us being. The Brotherhood of Man is an idle dream unless there is a recognition of the Fatherhood of God.

This is American language; it be-speaks the necessity for religious education on every level of our instruction. The President of Yale University spoke with perhaps even greater clarity and cogency in 1937 when he said:

If our historical studies have taught us anything it is that selfish materialism leads straight to the City of Destruction. To fight it we have need of clear intelligence. We have no less need of unwavering loyalty to the Golden Rule. . . . I call on all members of the faculty, as members of a thinking body, freely to recognize the tremendous validity and power of the teaching of Christ in our life-and-death struggle against the forces of selfish materialism. If we lose in that struggle, judging by present events abroad, scholarship as well as religion will disappear.

That, too, is American language; and quite as eloquently as would the words of a bishop or a priest, this speech of the President of Yale be-speaks the necessity of religious education on every level of instruction.

Such education is not, however, being provided in our schools and colleges. It is ruled out of tax-supported schools on the premise we have already discussed. The secularization of elementary and secondary education has carried over into the collegiate education provided in State and private colleges alike. Here, too, Religion has been not merely departmentalized in our liberal arts and other curricula, it has been consciously eliminated or unconsciously neglected. Herein lies the root cause, to one man's way of thinking, of the two saddest problems of education in America: 1. The social sterility of the courses which our colleges do offer; and

2. The increasingly obvious failure of our colleges to produce well-rounded, dynamic leaders of the *responsible* society that a democracy should be.

I do not know what solution of this problem will eventually commend itself to State schools, to private institutions or to non-Catholic educators. It is not my place to venture recommendations in their regard. I am certain their best thought is being devoted to finding a solution acceptable to them. But I do know the solution which my own people have been forced to devise and I can tell you something about *that*. It may be helpful to you in formulating your own thoughts on the matter; in any case, it may help clarify some of your thought about us.

We have long since decided that to secure for religion its needed place in integral and democratic education we must undertake to provide our own educational system, primary, secondary and collegiate. The effort to do so has been Herculean; it has demanded energies on the part of our leaders and sacrifices on the part of our people which would be utterly out of proportion, indeed indefensible, did we not count the purpose so high. For conscience sake and in order to save what we know to be necessary for moral education, we have submitted to a system of double-taxation and material disadvantages in what one critic did not hesitate to call "the most substantial and dramatic act of faith in education that is being made by any section of the American populace."

GOD IS THE REALITY

The educational system of the Catholic Church in this country has been devised and developed on the premise that integral education must be essentially religious, that man is at once a rational and a religious animal, that if either reason or religion be neglected, he tends to be more an animal than a man, more a menace to society than a member of it. But, despite its Catholic religious tone, this system, according to a Protestant author, adheres in most respects to the early American model, the educational system inspired by the

American conviction with regard to the true relation between religion and life to which we have already referred.

I do not know how far others could accommodate their conscientious educational principles to the premises of our philosophy of education, or to what extent others could give God the place in liberal education that our schools strive to give Him. But again you may be interested to know what we conceive that place to be. We strive to remember in all our instruction, scientific, liberal arts, or sociological, that God is the Reality of reality itself; that even with the most complete knowledge and love of all things else, God is still the supreme object of human knowledge, human love and human striving; that all men are created in the image and likeness of God, though made imperfect even in their created natures by sin; that men remain free, despite sin, and capable of cooperating with God's grace unto their personal perfection and the regeneration of their society; that to do either we must know and love our fellowmen and all other creatures both in themselves and in their relation to the true cosmos, a cosmos not limited to the material order but to all of earth and heaven, purgatory and hell; that within this Cosmos there are spiritual forces both good and evil, the knowledge of which is no less important than the knowledge of the laws of matter; that there is a purpose to individual lives and to

history itself; that the City of Man is interrelated with the City of God; that God's Providence operates in human events and that He is not far from us since in Him we live and move and have our being; that education should prepare us in the light of all these truths to master the nature which is below us in order to achieve the nature which is above us; that education should give us a knowledge of all things such as to enable us to utilize nature unto our comfort and convenience and liberty, but especially unto the liberty we have as the sons of God, not merely sons because His creatures, but sons because sharers, potentially, at least, of the Life and the Love and the Liberty by which God Himself is Divine.

It is our Catholic conviction that the liberal arts are not truly liberalizing unless they include the influence of these truths, the truths which, as we see it, both liberalize and liberate the human spirit from the things which otherwise enslave and degrade men and nations. We are confident that the integration with the liberal arts tradition of these religious truths in no wise limits or reforms the tremendous natural validity of that tradition. On the contrary, we consider that it was out of the blend of these truths, the religious truths provided by Revelation, and the rational truths of the liberal arts, that Western Civilization came into being, the civilization which made Christendom and

which gave our society the last unity it had.

Education will not be able to its most urgent work of helping store unity to our broken society until education has come to terms with these spiritual values once again. This conviction is not limited to Catholics; indeed, one wishes that Catholics appreciated it as vividly as they should and gave it the militant expression that it is receiving from sensitive non-Catholics all over the world. Writing of the intangible world which religion opens up to the liberal arts student, a professor at the University of Chicago has written:

What was the secret of the unity, the comparative harmony during the ages when Western Civilization began to expand? Harmony and unity are the great needs of the twentieth century. Indeed, as our ancestors managed to achieve them, it was not by means of standardized methods of work or entertainment. It was not by means of large economic units.

The unity possessed by Europeans in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was founded on a view of reality that has become dim with the passage of the centuries. Like all men and women always, our European ancestors were concerned with the material conditions of their daily existence and with the strains and occasional joys of their relations with their families and neighbors. But they saw man's place in the universe in a different light from their modern descendants. For centuries the Christian faith had accustomed them to give priority to the spiritual, the immaterial side of the nature. . . .

As long as Christians generally were convinced of the existence of this reality, and as long as Europeans generally were Christians, they had a less destructible basis for unity than can ever be found in the tangible. The uniformity of external things, through standard products, is no substitute for medieval unity, as a basis for world community. If humanity is starved for charity and love, as today, the physical world, where all is relative, cannot provide them. . . .

The process of cultural disintegration and of increasingly colossal conflict that has characterized the past half century can be halted, if at all, only by man himself, by supreme efforts of men's wills in the service of cultural unification and understanding. Such a halt depends upon a determined stand by men of good will against the social and cultural and even the economic developments which the technical inventions of mankind, including the use of atomic energy, facilitate. The price of a halt would seem to be once again the establishment of faith among mankind that all are one in Christ, that men have it in their power to become free agents for good, less because of the advances in practical science and technology than in spite of them. If and when they act in the belief that machinery and mechanics could provide them with means of liberating themselves from slavery to the stereotyped existence which machinery and mechanics have created, they will have taken a decisive step towards understanding each other and towards making humanity into a single family.

Here is the practical basis of the need for integration of Religion with Liberal Arts and all education.

Never was unity so ardently desired as today it is. Never was it so

tragically needed. Never did those who walk in the tradition of the Liberal Arts, never did educators and priests generally, have so imperative a mandate to promote the things which make for peace, which foster unity. But let us not be deceived. Humanity does not lift itself by its own bootstraps. We cannot *think* ourselves or *study* ourselves or *lecture* ourselves into unity. Human unity is a moral concept. It is attained through a meeting of *minds* and a blending of *wills*, through the rational and willing acceptance of *law*. Underlying that law must be morality; sustaining morality is religion. Somehow, sometime, by some formula you must find the way to integrate with your liberal arts and other educational programs the contribution to moral and social building, as well as personal perfection, which Religion and Religion alone can make.

Until you do, you build in vain who strive to build a human city. When you do, then, under God, you will build not merely for time, but for Eternity. You will educate not merely the sons of men, but the children of God. You will then be what the professor should always be: no mere purveyor of facts to brains that disintegrate and die, but the inspirer of souls that never die—souls to whom you will be, even as the priest, channels of the Spirit of God, co-founders of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth!

Mr. Taylor's Mission to the Vatican

SUMNER WELLS

Former Under Secretary of State

*Reprinted from the New York HERALD TRIBUNE**

IT IS unfortunate that the controversy over Myron Taylor's mission as the President's personal representative at the Vatican should have recently flared up again, and this time in what appears to be an acute and even virulent form. The world is already so torn by intolerance, by prejudice, and by antagonisms of one kind or another that it is deplorable that the existing bitterness should now be accentuated here in the United States.

The decision of the President to continue Mr. Taylor's mission, at least until peace has been restored, has been violently assailed and as vigorously defended. There is no need to question the motives nor the good faith of either side in the present dispute. But the form which the controversy has taken tends to obscure a number of simple facts.

Demands for the termination of Mr. Taylor's mission have been based upon the following charges:

It is alleged that President Roosevelt's decision to send a personal representative to the Vatican violated the principle of the separation of Church and State. It is further asserted that the step taken circumvents constitutional requirements. Finally,

in the words of a recent protest, the Taylor mission is said to represent "one of the most dangerous chapters in modern secret diplomacy."

It is hard to understand the reasoning behind the charge that the policy inaugurated by President Roosevelt, and continued by President Truman, runs counter to the principle of the separation of Church and State. The appointment of a Presidential representative at the Vatican cannot affect the provisions of our Constitution, nor shape our own internal policies.

IS SOVEREIGN STATE

From the purely juridical standpoint the territory known as the Vatican City constitutes a sovereign state. It is so recognized by the majority of nations.

At the outbreak of the war, almost every country except the Soviet Union and the United States, whether constitutionally Protestant as in the case of Great Britain, whether officially non-Christian, as in the case of Japan, or whether anti-Christian, as in the case of Nazi Germany, had accredited diplomatic representatives to the Holy See. Those diplomatic missions had ob-

* 230 W. 41st St., New York 18, N. Y., Jan. 15, 1947. Copyright, 1947, New York Tribune Inc.

viously not been appointed in order to further any extension of the influence of the Church over State. They were appointed because the powerful influence exercised by the Vatican throughout a great part of the world was recognized, and because the governments so represented knew that the Vatican had available to it sources of information possessed by very few, if any, other modern governments.

The President is intrusted by the Constitution with the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. If he is to carry out these responsibilities successfully, he must be free to utilize the services of such agents as he may consider necessary in order to obtain the information he may require whenever that is not available through normal channels. The history of the foreign relations of the United States contains innumerable instances of the exercise of this right by American Presidents. Personal representatives of the President have often been appointed where official diplomatic relations have not existed.

One of the reasons why President Roosevelt sent his personal representative to the Vatican was his realization that the United States government must have available to it every possible shred of intelligence which might assist it in prosecuting the war or in laying the foundations for a just and lasting peace.

But I believe that an even more compelling motive was the President's conviction that the Vatican represented a great moral force, and that it was to the advantage of the American people that their government should be in a position where it could co-operate effectively with every world agency which was striving for the creation of a better international order and for a peace based upon principles of justice and of morality.

No unprejudiced American citizen, whatever his creed may be, can deny that the Vatican constitutes one of the most powerful moral forces in the world of today, and that Pope Pius XII has been an outstanding leader in the battle for the abandonment of policies of cruelty and of aggression, and for the adoption of such standards in the relations between nations as can make for enduring peace.

SECRECY ESSENTIAL

It is impossible to deal seriously with the charge that Mr. Taylor's mission constitutes a dangerous "chapter in modern secret diplomacy." The foreign relations of the United States could not be carried on if every report rendered to the President by one of his agents abroad had immediately to be made public. Under any such requirement as that, the sources of American information would dry up within five minutes.

No American diplomatic agent in recent years has carried out his duties with greater discretion, with greater success and with a greater regard for his country's interests than Myron Taylor. When the full story of his mission is finally recorded, it will be recognized that it has been of great service to the United States. It will also be seen, as the Rev. Dr. Everett Clinchy said a few months ago, that there has been nothing in this mission which "need alarm" any sincere Protestant.

At least until peace has been restored to the world, the means of co-operation between the Vatican and the President of the United States afforded by Mr. Taylor's mission should continue. The termination of his mission as a result of the present agitation would not only renew religious rivalries which most Americans had hoped were permanently stilled, but it would also hinder this government in its efforts to bring about the establishment of a just and lasting peace.



Family Income

In 1935-1936, according to the National Resources Planning Board, more than a quarter of the Nation's families had yearly incomes of less than \$750; more than two-fifths had incomes of less than \$1,000; nearly two-thirds had incomes of less than \$1,500.

Seven years later, studies made by the OPA in 1942 showed that about one-fifth of families had incomes of less than \$1,000 a year while about one-half of families earned less than \$2,000. Even at the wartime peak of employment in 1944, according to an article in the March, 1946 issue of *The Child*, U. S. Children's Bureau official publication, "37 per cent of the families of wage earners were receiving an income substantially below the requirements for health and decency."

Even in the boom year of 1945, almost one-third of the nation's families had incomes ranging from \$2,000 down. (Bureau of Agricultural Economics, August, 1946). *From TALK IT OVER, Series G-117, 1946, National Institute of Social Relations, Inc., Washington, D. C.*

Do Catholics Know the Score?

RICHARD PATTEE

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

WE CATHOLICS of the United States point with considerable pride to the fact that our numbers have steadily increased down through the decades until we now constitute a mass of some 25,000,000 citizens. In our more exuberant moments we may even hoist this figure to a round and comfortable 30,000,000 and, by means of a little mental arithmetic, visualize a future in which we shall form a majority of the people of the United States.

Periodically, by way of showing that Catholics really are not as backward and unprogressive as some think, those of us addicted to statistics delve into such matters as the number of Catholics who have achieved distinction in physics, chemistry, horseshoe tossing, deep-sea diving or table tennis. We come up with the complacent conviction that in every field of legitimate human endeavor we have representatives who do not shame us as coreligionists.

All this, perhaps, is entirely to the good. But we should not be led astray by mere mathematical computation. We should have learned long since that mere numbers of people do not mean greatness or influence. If this were strictly the case,

India or China, with their teeming millions, might well be at the vanguard of the nations. It is obviously not the number itself, but what that number does and how it does it that counts. And it is concerning this point, with special reference to the international scene today, that I wish to address these few reflections.

It is almost a platitude to assert that American Catholics are definitely not pulling their proportional weight in the formation of the public opinion of the country. It might be even more accurate to say that we are, in general, less influential, less telling in making our ideas effective than almost any other minority in the United States. And this is particularly tragic at a time when issues are up that strike deep at the roots of the civilization that the Church has done so much to build and to mold.

TOLERATED EXPRESSION OF MINORITY

It is not always for the lack of instruments of expression. The Catholic press of the country, existing as it does in practically every diocese, reaches in one form or another upwards of fifteen million of our people. There is certainly no dearth of Catholic readers of the Catholic papers.

* New Haven 7, Conn., August, 1946

Our reviews of opinion, some large and others small, make a valuable and important contribution to bringing to our people the so-called Catholic "slant" on the things that are happening. But this does not mean necessarily that this same public opinion that is receiving from different sources sound doctrine and sound interpretations is, in its turn, making the impact on *general* opinion and in the long run on policy that it ought.

Here, precisely, is the rub. To what extent are we as Catholics making our views so well known that they color and influence the major decisions of the nation? I think even the most optimistic among us must be chagrined at the fact that this situation is not coming to pass either with the effectiveness or the celerity that we would wish.

One wonders how true is the statement of the distinguished British observer of things American, Mr. D. W. Brogan, who, in his little volume entitled, *The American Character*, writes:

The American public, the American politician, the American newspaper, has to allow for Catholic opinion because there are so many Catholics, not because Catholic opinion has any interest as such. And Catholics do not explain nearly so often as they denounce and deplore.

Here is a pretty severe indictment, couched in very plain language. Our strength in numbers makes us a force to be reckoned with, especially when elections come around. Newspapers

give us a reasonable amount of space because their reading public is bound to include a goodly number of Catholics. But, does Catholic opinion as such interest the larger public? Do we create that intellectual "climate," as the French call it, that makes the impact of our positive and constructive ideas significant and enduring? These are questions that we ought to be examining for the simple reason that innumerable issues are being debated, argued and analyzed with ultimate decisions made, and many of us have the feeling that our own contribution to their clarification is more often than not merely the tolerated expression of a minority that does not have to be taken into consideration too seriously.

POWER OF PRESSURE GROUPS

We are all painfully aware of what minority pressure groups do and accomplish in this land of ours. The United States is probably the *Ultima Thule* of those who join together to put over proposals and ideas. Those of us who were privileged to attend the United Nations Conference at San Francisco were astonished at the fecundity of the United States in begetting organizations, groups, committees, commissions, congresses and societies for every conceivable purpose, good and bad. It is amazing how such an organization as that which flourishes around the "liberal" weekly, *The Nation*, manages to get into the

public press and into high places with its protests and petitions on almost any issue that it chooses to promote. Perhaps this will be discounted as mere pressure politics and lobbying that is unsound and undignified. Granted. No one would urge that Catholics go at the achievement of an end with the same drum beating and high pressure methods employed by such groups as the one just mentioned. I cite it merely to indicate that we live in an age when it is indispensable to employ certain tactics in order to get things across.

On both international and domestic matters we simply cannot assume that because we have sound ideas that are in conformity with human nature and the natural law, that somehow, in some way, obscure or otherwise, these ideas will permeate the body politic by osmosis. Something has to be done about them and an infinite amount of energy and effort made for them not only to be said but to be said so effectively that they make an impression.

RANK AND FILE

Certainly it is not sufficient for our Bishops to speak out periodically, as they do year after year, interpreting current issues in the light of the eternal truths. It is precisely the same thing as to have the great social Encyclicals at our finger tips and then do nothing about it. The real problem rests on the rank and file of Catholics, and very especially on lay

people, who, as the common soldiers, either carry out instructions or not. If they do not, nothing happens beyond the momentary impression made by a given declaration. If there is anything that we need desperately today it is an enlightened and intelligent lay leadership in the international field, and this is something that we do not have. In spite of the yeoman service of such organizations as the Catholic Association for International Peace, which has done admirable work, one finds in moving back and forth across the country that Catholics are not as yet hot and bothered about international issues and, since they are not, apathy dominates them to a disconcerting degree.

There are a large number of specific and very precise questions about which we ought to be expressing ourselves, and making our views felt anywhere. In some cases our people are disoriented and confused; in other cases they have not thought the problem through. I could list some of these questions very rapidly:

- I. The relations of the United States to the Soviet Union.
- II. The future of Germany, Austria and Italy.
- III. The character and nature of our obligations within the United Nations.
- IV. The Spanish question.
- V. The Argentine question.

These are only five of the more prominent ones. There are others,

principal and secondary, but for purposes of illustration these will do very nicely.

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

We have been surfeited, some will say, with material about the Soviet Union, about its system and its drawbacks. We know perfectly well what the Holy Father has said on atheistic communism and we are wholeheartedly in accord in condemning communism as a philosophy. All this is perfectly sound and perfectly true. But then we have the practical question of what are we going to do in a world inhabited by some 200,000,000 Soviet citizens, belonging to a compact state system that obviously is prepared to toss its weight about from now on? We cannot wish the USSR off the planet. We cannot move off ourselves. We have a reality that has to be faced. Do we want to go all out for collaboration in every possible form? Do we prefer to be cagey and play the game very close, until the Soviet government reveals its hand? Do we want to see a world in which two great blocs exist, side by side, with ill concealed hostility between them?

These are the practical questions of the day, with no reference at all to the intrinsic nature of sovietism or the postulates of communism. Are we, as Mr. Brogan suggested, merely denouncing and deplored, without suggesting what ought to be done to

work out some formula that will make living in this world more or less feasible? We cannot afford to be swayed solely by the natural emotional repugnance that all of us feel to communism. This force is abroad in the world. It is in the world for some purpose and has to be taken realistically for what it is. How can we strive for a just and effective solution that does not lead to the sacrifice of principle but that also does not constitute a mere policy of sterile denunciation?

Catholic opinion ought certainly to begin to make itself manifest on the issue of Germany, Austria and Italy. I mention these three simply because they happen to be among the most acute of the problems which have not been solved to date. One could add, obviously, Poland, Yugoslavia and the Baltic countries, the status of each of which literally cries out for redress. But the Germany question, as most of the secular writers are emphasizing, cannot be indefinitely postponed in its solution. For well over a year since the conclusion of hostilities, we have done nothing except perpetuate the evils of fragmentation and division. We talk of food and curtail the capacity of Germany to produce. We talk of permanent inability to wage war and conceive of a Germany in which people could not even live, let alone promote war.

The news that is coming out of many parts of Germany, in trickles

ut in sufficient volume to make horrible reading, tells of the suffering of millions of Germans, especially in Silesia and the areas ceded to Poland. Displacement, expulsion, extirpation with no regard for anything except political expediency, has become the rule. Because these people are German does not make them less human. The policy toward the Sudeten Germans makes one wonder at the strange gyrations of history that now place them as one of the most harassed groups in all Europe. Large numbers of these are German Catholics. They are our coreligionists. They are human beings, who simply cannot be accused of collective, personal guilt for everything that went on from 1933 to the siege of Berlin. There are some 80,000,000 of them all over central Europe. If they are persecuted and dehumanized, it is indispensable that voices be raised to protest it as a crime against God and against people. And they have a right to live and know their future. Are American Catholics contributing to the creation of an enlightened public opinion on this question?

The mutilation and dismemberment of Austria is no less painful. Immediate assistance is clearly a duty of humanity: but no less necessary is insistence that Austria be meted out fair and just treatment in conformity with her needs as a people and as a nation. This possessor of a glorious tradition, hallowed through the ages,

is the recipient of scant attention with reference to the basic organization she must have to survive at all. The months slip by and Italy remains a diplomatic no-man's-land in a state that is chaotic and uncertain. We Catholics, by the very nature of things, have a singularly strong feeling for Italy and for its reconstruction. Italy is necessary to mankind and necessary to Europe. Here, again, a solidified, coherent, articulate public opinion ought to insist that a solution in harmony with the dignity of the Italian people be reached.

In April of 1945, the American hierarchy issued a brilliant and thoughtful statement on the United Nations and suggested those elements that should be incorporated to make it an enduring instrument for peace among nations. We know full well that many of these principles were not included in the Charter. We have seen the United Nations at work since its various agencies were created. We have been treated week after week to the spectacle of the Security Council in session in New York, and we have doubted. What should our position be on this question? Should we as a country put our full trust and faith in this organization, or should we not? There is a place for Catholic opinion here and it ought to be manifested strongly and vigorously.

No question has ever aroused the

emotionalism, the passion and the bitterness of the Spanish question. Catholics in general took a beating during the past ten years since, in most cases, their sympathies were with the Nationalist uprising. I think that some of our people went too far and defended General Franco almost as an article of faith. Others, perhaps, went too far in the opposite direction and conceived of him as a false prophet who would lead the Church into new enslavement.

SPANISH PEOPLE'S WELFARE

During the agitated years of the war many of our people were uncertain and ill at ease, for the defense of Franco and his policy became increasingly difficult. For one thing, few of our people know anything about Spain or Spanish politics. This, of course, is eloquently true of most of the violent detractors of Franco. Our secular press, in general, performed a very dubious service in presenting the story of the civil uprising. Those who see a fascist under every sofa had a veritable field day and made the case against Franco Spain black beyond all description. We have had some light shed on it since. Catholics may well feel proud of the great services of our wartime ambassador to Spain, Dr. Carlton J. H. Hayes. His public service, plus his admirable book on his mission, has clarified the atmosphere.

Today we are faced with the very

specific problem of whether our government should contribute to the removal of Franco by any means at its disposal. The strength of those who promote this idea is very great and should not be underestimated. The principle involved is of tremendous significance because it strikes at the heart of one of the most important issues we can possibly face: the degree to which we are willing to go to determine the form and composition of governments in other countries.

We do not have to defend Franco because he is a Catholic. We do not have to uphold his policies or acclaim him as a knight in white and shining armor bent on the restoration of Christianity. We need simply insist that in this, as in any similar situation, the Spanish people should have the say as to the nature of their government. The heat and fanfare that the Franco question has generated makes it particularly imperative that American Catholics become vocal, not to defend Franco *per se*, or on every score, but to defend the principle of national determination. And all this is aside from the fact that we know full well that the vigor with which the campaign against Franco is being promoted springs from motives very different than the welfare of the Spanish people.

In like manner, the now famous Argentine case requires the exercise of a common sense that has been amazingly absent. In traveling up

and down the country I have been perplexed and disturbed at the confusion that prevails over this question—analogous, in many respects, to the Spanish. Our people—I refer to our Catholic people—feel instinctively that many of the things that are urged are wrong. They are usually incapable of saying why. Here we need very definitely enlightenment, instruction, constant vigilance, to the end that a decent solution may be found to a very bad and dreary situation.

What can Catholics do about the whole thing, practically? There are many things. I have just come from a lecture series in Illinois and Iowa under the auspices of the Te Deum International, an extraordinary lay organization with its center in Springfield, Illinois, and under the direction of a local physician, Dr. John J. Donovan. In town after town in this area, Catholic spokesmen on the issues of the day are brought to present the interpretation of events and problems in the light of Catholic ideas. It is adult education, extension work, or call it what you will, in the best sense of the term. It inevitably gives local Catholics and others the chance to inform themselves on the issues and reply to difficulties in terms of Catholic ideas. Would that this type of thing were twenty times more extensive.

Would it be entirely out of place to express the hope that the powerful

Catholic bodies and the innumerable local organizations all over the country make it a part of their program of activity to contribute something to the creation of a Catholic opinion on international matters—now and in a hurry? This is no time for the slow and leisurely process of doing something in the grade schools in the hope that ultimately something will happen. We need Catholic spokesmen with an urgency that permits no delay. The next two or three years will unquestionably be filled with the most stirring events conceivable.

It can be argued, of course, that our people are terribly parochial minded; that they are distinguished by a strange unawareness of what foreign affairs mean; that they are just beginning to come up out of the purely proletarian atmosphere in which almost all of our fathers and grandfathers lived. All of this is true and is the historical explanation of why 25,000,000 Catholics make less impression on the public mind than almost any other group in the country. But it merely points up the matter I am discussing: namely, that it is high time we did something about it.

Lay leadership cannot be postponed in this field any more than it can be in the domestic. We have not done so badly in many national situations. In the American labor movement, we can take pride in the effective way in which Catholic ideas

have infiltrated ever since the days when Cardinal Gibbons pleaded on behalf of the Knights of Labor. In the field of foreign policy and international affairs we are still woefully weak. The time has come when our

international policy is determining our domestic. If we do not have sane, sensible, human foreign policy we possibly may not have to bother about any domestic policy at all. The situation is that urgent.

Prosperity

Prosperity must be defined in terms of real wealth and not of money. Money is no test whatever of a nation's prosperity or poverty. It has become a symbol of wealth or poverty of the individual, but as a standard of national wealth it is a myth. The prosperity of a nation must be reckoned, not in terms of coin, note or check, but in terms of goods for consumption. Prosperity must be defined in terms of consumption and not in terms of exchange of goods. What shall it profit a nation to produce untold wealth if that wealth is not then consumed? What gain is it to have a great foreign trade if thousands are still poor and do not consume the wealth which the nation produces? Consumption by individuals—that is the acid test. Prosperity depends on wealth produced and consumed.—*James Hickey in HIBERNIA, December, 1946.*

Correction: The filler, "The Wrong Way," which appeared on p. 87 our February number, should have been credited to Father Thomas McCarthy, Editor of the Los Angeles TIDINGS.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: John LaFarge EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

PUBLISHER: Gerald C. Tracy

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.